



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2006

No. 30

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 9, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES W. DENT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: "Whoever meditates on the law of the Lord will bring forth much fruit at harvest time."

Lord God, who can bring forth blessings from just deeds, listen to our prayer this day. Give us the wisdom to take time to meditate upon Your revelation, Your law. Help us to find knowledge in prayerful reflection and be assured of Your love, especially in times of difficulty.

Your law holds nature and all peoples together.

May lawmakers today reflect the mindset and gracious manner revealed in Your loving commands. And may their work contain the depth of justice and the expansive embrace of human goodness that You reveal to Your people, by giving them Your law which lasts until now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PORTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minute speeches on each side.

THE UAE AND OUR PORTS

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, putting the UAE in charge of our ports is as crazy as outsourcing our Border Patrol to Saudi Arabia.

We have two Achilles heels: our Mexican border and our seaports.

The UAE says that they are our friends. Here is some straight talk: the UAE gave us two terrorists on 9/11. They provided the money for the attacks of 9/11. They recognized the Taliban on 9/11. They refused to freeze Osama bin Laden's assets after 9/11. They have voted against us at the U.N. 90 percent of the time since 9/11. And today they announced that they will threaten the United States of America if we block this transaction. If these are our friends, what the heck does an enemy look like?

Mr. Speaker, we have but one choice: block this ports deal. We should not outsource our national security to anyone.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET OUT OF TOUCH WITH PRIORITIES OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bush is now touting the line item veto as the magic formula to get our deficit under control. Then why does the President not begin by actually sending Congress a balanced budget?

For 5 years now, one of the President's main priorities has been to provide billions in tax breaks to his friends in the pharmaceutical and insurance industry, the oil and gas industry, and America's wealthiest elite. When the President provides these tax breaks to his friends, he increases the deficit and prevents the Federal Government from being able to properly address the concerns of hardworking Americans.

There is no doubt the President has lost control of the deficit, piling mountains of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren. Under President Bush, a projected 10-year \$5.6 trillion surplus has turned into a \$3.3 trillion deficit. This year the deficit is expected to reach \$423 billion, the largest deficit in history. And yet the President suggests making his tax breaks to his friends permanent.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, according to the Centers for Disease Control, every 6 minutes someone in this country dies from an infection they picked up in a hospital. That is 90,000 people and a total cost of \$50 billion. Yet when hospitals adhere to patient safety measures, they can dramatically reduce these infections.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H793

A hospital in Oklahoma performed 400 surgeries without an infection. A hospital in Pittsburgh reduced these infections greatly and saved millions of dollars. A hospital in St. Louis received savings of \$1.5 million.

I am pleased that the Energy and Commerce Committee will take up this issue and hold hearings on this in a couple of weeks. We need to take action and save lives. At this time when we get so concerned about so many issues in America, is it not time that Congress tackled these issues head-on and worked out such issues as pay-for-performance incentives through Medicare and Medicaid to greatly reduce infections and save thousands of lives?

To learn more on this, people can look at my Web site at murphy.house.gov.

URGING COMPREHENSIVE LOBBYING REFORM

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, while Republicans are doing their best to distance themselves from their lobbying scandal, they just cannot seem to shake off Jack Abramoff.

Jack Abramoff recently told Vanity Fair: "Any important Republican who comes out and says they didn't know me is certainly lying."

While President Bush denies knowing him, Jack Abramoff says he knew President Bush well enough to joke with him about weight lifting. Former Speaker Gingrich said he didn't know Jack Abramoff well; yet Jack Abramoff said, "I have more pictures of Newt Gingrich than I do of my wife."

Senator CONRAD Burns, Jack Abramoff says: "Every appropriation we wanted we got. Our staffs were as close as they could be. They practically used Signatures as their cafeteria."

And to add insult to injury, in January, Senator SANTORUM, the architect of the K Street Project and a Republican point person on lobbying reform, vowed to stop his weekly lobbyist meetings; yet we now find he continues to do them.

It is just business as usual here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans may be lip-syncing reform, but clearly the "for sale" sign is still up on the West Lawn.

It is time for a change. It is time to change the culture of corruption in Washington, a culture that has real costs for the American people. We can do better. We need to do better.

MEDICARE PROGRAM NOT CONFUSING

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to discuss the Medicare part D prescription drug plan, a historic program that renews our commitment to our Nation's seniors.

This plan gives seniors choices for prescription drug coverage that will cost less while offering more benefits. It has brought Medicare, a program created 40 years ago, into the 21st century. Millions of seniors who were without access to drugs are now getting them and many are saving thousands of dollars a year.

Clearly, people have liked what they have heard about the program as sign-ups for the third week of February amounted to 546,000 and the week before numbered 543,000. All told, almost 26 million people have signed up so far.

The Democrats say that seniors are confused by this program. I am feeling a little bit confused myself, and here is why: Democrats are holding town halls for the sole purpose of criticizing this plan while at the same time telling seniors they should consider signing up. Well, I guess I can understand why they are confused.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing confusing about a program that will help Medicare beneficiaries pay for their prescription drugs while at the same time saving them money.

MISPLACED PRIORITIES AND FISCAL MISMANAGEMENT

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when future generations of Americans look back at this time in our Nation's history, they will have to conclude that this Republican Congress and White House has been the most fiscally irresponsible in our Nation's history.

In 5 years we have turned a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus into a projected \$3.5 trillion of deficit, a \$9 trillion fiscal reversal. Seventy-seven percent of it is attributable to tax cuts, most of which benefit the wealthy, and to the so-called war on terrorism.

And why do I say the so-called "war on terrorism"? Because in this budget, this President's budget, he would provide tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans, greater than the entire amount of money he wants to spend on homeland security. And when you consider the fact that half of America's students do not even graduate from high school today, you have to ask why the amount of money he gives to the top 1 percent of Americans is almost twice as much as the entire amount of money he wants to spend on the education budget; and it is almost three times what he would spend on veterans health care.

This is misplaced priorities and fiscal mismanagement.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S CHILDREN

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for voting overwhelmingly to put the port deal on ice. We are not anti-Arab. We want disclosure. We want certainty of transactions. We want no secrecy on these particular deals.

I also want to thank them for their courageous vote and excellent vote on H.R. 3132, the Children's Safety and Violent Crime Reduction Act. Overwhelmingly passed by voice vote, that measure is on its way to the other Chamber to set up for the first time a national sex offender registry, getting background checks on foster care parents so we know if we are putting our kids with appropriate individuals, a national database requiring bracelet monitoring for sex offenders.

We track library books better than we do sexual predators. It is time we get this right. This bill does that. It puts in law guarantees that will protect our kids. It is high time we passed this measure. I thank Senator FRIST, John Walsh, among others, who have brought this to the forefront of the national conscience, and I urge we get that bill to the President's desk before we lose another child.

THE RISING COST OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has released a report that details what most of us already knew, that health care costs are rising and they are rising at an increasing rate.

The bureaucrats and the Members of Congress talk about SGR, they talk about pay-for-performance, and they talk about CPT codes. What is left out of the discussion is that which is most important, and that is the patient.

As a physician for over 25 years, I know that the current health care road we are on continues to move us in the wrong direction. A patient-centered system is necessary if we are to increase access to quality care.

I ask my colleagues here in this Chamber to take a bipartisan approach to solving this issue: look at the numbers; read the reports; and, above all, listen to the American people. They are the families and the small businesses and the employers who are trying to provide health care coverage.

America has the ingenuity, but we must also have the will to make the decisions necessary to get us on the right road in health care.

WIRELESS PRIVACY AMENDMENT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a good day for the millions of

Americans who own a cell phone. For several years, wireless phone customers have had more and more reason to question the privacy of their cell phone numbers. Right now a database of cell phone numbers is being compiled by the industry so that companies can offer wireless directory assistance in the future, but most Americans would rather not have their personal cell phone number made available to just anyone.

Yesterday after 2 years of effort on this issue, the Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously approved my amendment to put the power back into the hands of consumers. The amendment simply forbids wireless phone companies from disclosing the cell phone number of any customer without prior express authorization from the customer. Just common sense.

America is counting on us to do something about this, and we have the power to do so. Let us bring this important legislation to the floor and protect Americans' privacy rights.

AMERICA'S SECURITY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the floor this morning, there is a common theme. It is all about America's security, from cell phones to ports to reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act. Our goal is to keep America secure and put the focus on America's security agenda, our economic security.

And tomorrow we will have new numbers out, and we know they are going to be strong for our unemployment rates, for our productivity growth, for new jobs creation. We are looking forward to those announcements.

This body continues to focus on the moral security of this great Nation: our retirement security; our energy security; and, yes, our national security. And I congratulate the Members of this body and thank our leadership for reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act this week. Our focus: keep America secure so that future generations have the opportunity to live those big dreams that today they dream.

□ 1015

POSITIVE NEWS ABOUT THE MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services recently reported that 61 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries in South Carolina have prescription drug coverage, and that almost 50 percent of the beneficiaries of

the Second Congressional District where Orangeburg Prep is located have prescription drug coverage.

Since November 15, more than 25 million people have chosen to participate in this new program and are now enjoying substantial savings on the cost of their prescription drugs compared to what they used to have to pay or did not pay with no coverage. The Sun News recently reported that Mary Simms of Lexington registered for the new benefit with her plan that now just costs her \$15 a month, where she used to spend \$80 on her prior plan.

As the enrollment process continues, I encourage seniors throughout my State to join the millions of other Americans who are now benefiting from this valuable program which will enable them to live healthier, happier and longer lives.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT HENRY PRENDES

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in Nevada we faced one of our worst nightmares a few weeks ago. One of our heroes, a law enforcement officer, a Metropolitan Police Department officer, Sergeant Henry Prendes, was shot down and brutally killed. He responded to a domestic violence call as a law enforcement officer, and as he appeared on the scene, a gentleman was waiting for him with an automatic weapon, and with over 50 rounds, brutally murdered Mr. Prendes.

Yesterday, in the Children's Safety and Violent Crime Reduction Act, in the act there was a provision that would memorialize Mr. Prendes for his efforts as a great American hero, a loving father and a loving husband. In the bill, it provides for a mandatory 30-year sentence for anyone that brutally murders a law enforcement or public safety officer or who conspires or attempts to kill.

This is an example of getting tough on crime. It is time to say enough is enough, and I applaud this House of Representatives for passing the act yesterday.

Also in the act was another provision that I provided, which was for additional background checks and faster and streamlined background checks for school teachers across this Nation.

RECOGNIZING JASON MCELWAIN AND THE GREECE ATHENA HIGH SCHOOL TROJANS

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an outstanding young man, his supportive teammates

and an inspirational performance on the basketball court.

In a matter of just 4 minutes, Jason McElwain and the Greece Athena High School Trojans showed us all the power of dedication, teamwork and perseverance. Jason also placed his heart and soul into helping the Trojans as team manager, and although never getting a chance to play, became an indispensable teammate.

Jason has also been challenged every day by autism, a disability that, while difficult, has not undercut Jason's goal or his support for the team. In turn, Jason's teammates, led by Coach Jim Johnson, have embraced him and believed in him, becoming his greatest friends and supporters.

This teamwork and mutual respect was never clearer than on the night of February 15. With only 4 minutes remaining in the final game of the regular season, Jason made his remarkable debut for the Trojans. He went on to make six 3-pointers and finished with 20 points.

A true hero and the true meaning of the word teamwork was discovered that night on the hardwood in Greece. And 2 weeks later, that teamwork propelled the Trojans to the very top as they won their sectional championship. Jason's perseverance and his teammates' support serve as a great example to us all.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their remarkable achievement, I ask this honorable body to join me in honoring Jason McElwain and the Greece Athena High School Basketball Trojans.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 713 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 713

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no

amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this structured rule under consideration provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform.

It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read.

It waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this resolution.

This rule provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. They shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, this rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and its underlying impor-

tant legislation reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy, which was created in 1998 to be the primary shaper, coordinator and proponent of Federal efforts to end drug abuse in our communities across America.

By supporting this legislation to reauthorize the ONDCP's activities for the next 5 years, Congress will reaffirm its support for national programs to combat the consequences of drug abuse in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program known as HIDTA. It also makes the development and implementation of Federal drug policy more streamlined, efficient and accountable.

H.R. 2829 accomplishes this goal by implementing a number of meaningful reforms to ONDCP and to our national drug control strategy. It provides the director of the ONDCP with a rank equal to Cabinet secretaries. While not affecting the President's ability to undermine the makeup of his Cabinet, it will ensure that the director will be able to interact with other department heads as an equal peer as this person coordinates our national drug policies.

This legislation also reaffirms the role of the ONDCP director as the principal coordinator of national drug policy and enhances effectiveness and accountability in drug treatment by requiring a uniform system of drug treatment evaluation based on results. It also enhances the national antidrug abuse media campaign, preserves and strengthens the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program and places a greater emphasis on providing resources to critical emerging drug threats that face our country.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the war on drugs is an ongoing struggle, but one that is also where we are seeing improvement, real improvements with positive real-world effects for American families. As President Bush outlined in his State of the Union address, there has been a 19 percent decline in overall drug teen use over the last 5 years, which translates into about 700,000 fewer young people using drugs. I think that is significant. This did not happen by accident.

But despite the fact that illegal drug use for 8th, 10th and 12th graders has been trending down since 2001, American teens still engage in risky drug-related behavior far too frequently. Nationwide, each day approximately 7,500 children between the ages of 12 and 17 try alcohol for the first time and over 30 percent of high school students report having ridden in a car with a friend who has been drinking.

Even more alarmingly, each day about 3,500 teens try marijuana for the first time, 3,500 teens try marijuana for the first time every day, and one in four children have been offered drugs at school.

Most disturbing of all, 12 million Americans age 12 and older have tried what is called methamphetamines,

known as meth, a drug known principally for its equally addictive and destructive qualities.

We all know that the battle to keep our kids drug-free starts at home. Over two-thirds of teens say that the greatest risk for them in using marijuana is upsetting their parents, and we know that children who are not regularly monitored by their parents are four times more likely to use illicit drugs.

Congress has an important role to play in the process of protecting our Nation's families and communities from the devastating effects of drug use and drug addiction. This legislation will allow the ONDCP to continue fighting on the domestic front in the war on drugs through comprehensive efforts like what we call the Major Cities Initiative, which targets drug abuse in large metropolitan areas that have the highest rates of current illicit drug use by developing inventories of Federal, State and local resources for prevention, treatment and law enforcement.

By passing this legislation, the ONDCP will also be empowered to continue its involvement in a number of education programs and outreach activities whose results are backed by sound scientific data which have dramatically helped to reduce drug addiction across America.

This legislation will also allow ONDCP to continue its fight on the international front of the war on drugs. America has gotten a little bit better in choking off the supply for drugs through fostering a closer working relationship with countries, including our neighbors to the south, including Mexico, where marijuana cultivation fell almost 25 percent between 2003 and 2004 and opium poppy cultivation dropped about 27 percent during that same time.

In Colombia, the coca crop has declined by more than one-third from its high point of expansion in 2001, a pattern that holds true for the other large Andean coca-growing countries of Peru and Bolivia.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, America can by no means declare victory in the war on drugs. Many challenges lie ahead in teaching our children to simply say no and abstain from using drugs, in protecting our communities from crime and domestic upheavals caused by drug use and in disrupting international markets that bring to and provide this country with illegal drugs.

□ 1030

But progress is being made in no small part due to the actions taken by this Congress, my colleagues who care very immensely and deeply about the children and families of our home districts, and due to this administration to continue the fight for our communities, our children, and our future.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the restrictive rule and the underlying legislation reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

As our colleague from Texas has already noted, the rule makes in order 15 amendments to be offered by Members from both sides of the aisle. But what he did not mention is that the rule blocks 10 other amendments which were considered yesterday in the Rules Committee. It blocks them from being offered on the floor today.

Included in the 10 blocked amendments is a proposal offered by my good friend, Representative BEAN, that would have required the Government Accounting Office to examine the unintended effects of hyperactive disorder drugs.

At a time when more and more children and adults are being diagnosed with some form of attention deficit disorder, this study could go a long way towards helping all of us better understand the problem. Yet my friends in the majority on the Rules Committee blocked this amendment from being considered. Perhaps it is because they do not want to address the issue, or perhaps it is because they are trying to defeat Representative BEAN in November. Whatever the reason, the House will not have the opportunity to consider this important amendment today because the rule prohibits it.

The rule also does not permit Representative WATERS from offering her amendment, which would have required the ONDCP to develop objectives for reducing drug overdoses and the spread of HIV/AIDS and hepatitis. Her commonsense amendment, too, is blocked from consideration under the rule. So while this rule is certainly more generous than most of those in the past, it is not by any stretch of the imagination open.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell on the specifics of this legislation, which we all agree is important and necessary. I do, however, wish to speak briefly about the issues facing our communities, mine specifically, due to drug abuse and our failed efforts to rehabilitate abusers.

A little history, first. In 1971, President Nixon declared the so-called modern-day "war on drugs."

He characterized drug abuse as "America's Public Enemy No. 1." He argued that drug addiction is a public problem. Since then, since 1971, Congress has attempted to pass laws, or passed laws, that cracked down on drug usage and harshly punished those who used these addictive poisons.

Though our intentions have largely been sincere, we have yet to institute policies that reflect a comprehensive understanding of this continuing prob-

lem. In America's black communities, minimum sentencing guidelines instituted by Congress and State legislatures for drug offenders and for other nonviolent crimes have had a lasting effect that will linger for generations to come.

Consider this: under current Federal law, the mandatory minimum sentence for being caught with 1 ounce of crack cocaine, a drug that the statistics show is more likely to be used by blacks than anyone else in our country, that mandatory minimum is longer than the mandatory minimum sentence for being caught with the exact same amount of powder cocaine, a drug that the statistics have shown is more likely to be used by whites than anyone else.

Even more, mandatory sentencing guidelines prohibit judges from using reasonable discretion to rehabilitate and not incarcerate the persons that are abusers. As a direct result of these draconian and discriminatory laws, black men in America are nearly 10 times more likely to be incarcerated for drug use than white males, notwithstanding the fact that they had the same amount; it was just nuanced as crack or powder cocaine.

Tens of thousands of black children are growing up in America in single-parent households, often plagued by poverty. Sure, drug usage is certainly a component of that problem. But the senseless mandatory locking up of first-time nonviolent drug offenders has done more to tear black and white families apart in America than almost anything else.

Drug prevention programs, such as those authorized in the underlying legislation, are important, as is the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The 1990 designation of south Florida as a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area has been very useful in directing Federal resources into our region to stop or attempt to stop the flow of drugs into the State and country.

I supported efforts under different programs, different administrations, Republican and Democratic, when I was a Federal judge two decades ago. I continue to support them today.

Nevertheless, I refuse to accept that our drug policies have had the positive effect that so many in this body claim. Drugs are still easily accessible on our streets and in our schools, and our drug laws are senseless, outdated, and in dire need of revision.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a day when the Members of this body will be willing to have a meaningful debate about the successes and the failures of Federal drug policies and mandatory minimum sentencing guidelines. Only then will we fully recognize how big a failure our policies have been and take the necessary, indeed the appropriate, steps, to rehabilitate, not write off drug abusers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1997 when I was elected to Congress, I was aware of the drug issue as it related to not only my district but, in general, to Texas and the country. And I became engaged in working with a group of Members who were intensely interested in understanding, developing a process, a policy, and a regular format for discussing drug use in America, those people who would bring drugs into the country, understanding how we stopped it, how we rehabilitated people, how we worked with law enforcement, how we dealt with the entire issue of policy from top to bottom.

One of those leaders at that time who continues to be one today will be our next speaker. He is a gentleman who intensely cares about the issue. He has traveled internationally, South America, around the world, to become an expert on not only drugs but also those things that surround drugs.

As we know, terrorism and terrorists make money off the money that comes from users in the United States of America. And so I am pleased to have at this time the gentleman who is the vice-chairman of the Criminal Justice and Drug Policy Subcommittee for Government Reform and the main author of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. In background with this, I would like to make a couple of comments about ONDCP and the drug issues before commenting on the amendments in particular.

We are, right now, over in the Government Reform Committee passing the 2006 Congressional Drug Control Budget and Policy Assessment. If you want to go to the Government Reform Web site, look under our subcommittee, Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Services, which I chair, ranking member ELIJAH CUMMINGS and I have put together a unanimous report that I believe will be adopted unanimously through the full committee as well, that outlines, Department by Department, the budgets and our concerns with the national drug control policy.

There are five major concerns in this overall budget policy assessment that you will see reflected both in the underlying bill today in ONDCP and the amendments that are coming to the floor.

First is the appalling lack of a methamphetamine strategy coming out of ONDCP and this administration. Individual agencies such as DEA have worked on methamphetamines, but there is an appalling lack of national strategy you will see in amendment after amendment today on the floor, fully supported by myself and Congressman CUMMINGS.

And we worked helping draft many of these amendments. The frustration is

incredible in this body and in the Senate, and that is reflected in today's debate and in this report; also interdiction assets, the frustration at an OMB-driven clause in the Homeland Security Department that would have separated narcotics from terrorism. Narcotics are the number one cause of terrorism deaths in America.

On September 11, 2001, 3,500 people died because of terrorism. That fall, 7,500 people died with narcotics abuse and the terrorism associated with that in the United States.

The next year, 30,000 people died in 2002. In 2003, 30,000 people died. In 2004, 30,000 people died. Already 7,500 people, approximately, have died in the United States. 105,000 people have died related to drug terrorism and abuse in America since 9/11.

We need to understand that while we have to watch for the major terrorist attacks in America, we are fighting terrorism in family homes, on the streets, and in neighborhoods on a daily basis in every suburban area, every rural area, and every urban center of the United States.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy, the so-called drug czar's office, was a creation of Congress. Senator BIDEN started it in the Senate. It was not something that the administration willingly did.

The administration today says they do not like this bill. Why do they not like this bill? They opposed it in my committee, but it passed unanimously. They opposed it in the Government Reform Committee. It passed unanimously. It was accepted by the joint referrals, and it went to the Judiciary Committee.

They came up with four proposals they did not like in it. It turned out that three, unbeknownst to them, and quite frankly showing some of our frustration with the drug czar's office, they did not even realize that three of the four amendments that they were objecting to were asked for by the Judiciary Committee, and now they were asking the Judiciary Committee to challenge that.

Of course, Chairman SENSENBRENNER did not take the amendments and knock them out; they were his in the Judiciary Committee. The fourth was the Dawson Community Act that was added to protect witnesses that was added by ELIJAH CUMMINGS, the ranking Democrat of my subcommittee, and had been supported earlier by the administration. Then they wanted to knock it out.

Right up until the Rules Committee, they were still trying to demote the drug czar from a Cabinet-level equivalency position. How can he give advice, and how can he review the budgets, as this act requires of the State Department, of the Defense Department, of the Department of Homeland Security if he does not have Cabinet status? It makes no sense.

They are continually trying to undermine the attempts that we have had

here. Over the past few years we have worked together in trying to move this bill. This bill moved unanimously through the House the last session of Congress. We believe we now have a bill that we will work through with the Senate as we work with the Republicans and the Democrats in the other body.

And we believe this bill will become law if not unanimously, nearly unanimously. There are 15 amendments today. Some amendments did not directly relate to this bill. But if Members want votes on some of these, that will be fine. We are prepared to accept, I believe, 13 of the 15 amendments, one we believe we can work out in conference. We are opposing one.

□ 1045

This is a bipartisan bill. And for those who have been concerned about meth, there is a lot in this bill related to meth that will force their hands. But the amendments today will make it clear that the United States Congress wants some action out of this administration on meth. It is bipartisan. It is suburban, rural, and urban and it is time that we started to act aggressively.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the House to vote down the previous question on this rule today so that the House might have an opportunity to consider two provisions which were dealt with in the Appropriations Committee yesterday. As we all know, this country has been rocked with stories about the potential purchase of port facilities in this country by a foreign corporation. I am not quite sure what the policy ought to be, but I do know that we ought to have a policy.

In fact, this country needs to have an overall policy with respect to the question of foreign investment in this country in general, but we do not. What we have discovered in this episode is that when a company such as the port terminal that has been discussed in newspapers, when a company like that is purchased by another foreign entity, it is only at the option of the two parties who have an economic interest that our government is even informed that the transaction is taking place. That is why our President had to tell the Nation that he did not have a clue about this port transaction.

Well, our President ought to have a clue and we ought to have a process that guarantees that he will be informed and that process should not rely on the voluntary action of the parties who stand to make money in the deal.

Yesterday in the Appropriations Committee we had an amendment adopted by Mr. LEWIS, the chairman,

which threw out the Dubai port deal. But the committee in that process declined to support the Sabo amendment which would have tried to establish a process under which this country would be guaranteed that our government would always know when such a transaction is being contemplated. And it would have set up a process which would have assured a time certain for Presidential action and would have given the Congress a role to play in that process.

Without the action of the Sabo amendment, we are simply, on an ad hoc basis, taking one action to forbid one port from being purchased by a foreign party but we are still leaving the country open to other deals about which our government could know nothing. I do not think there are 10 people in the Congress who knew, for instance, that a Chinese corporation had taken over the port at Long Beach. It would be nice if our Government knew things like that.

The only way that we are going to get something like this done is if we force the Congress to face the entire issue. And it seems to me that this bill is a handy vehicle for doing that. I know that people will say, "Well, you are trying to attach a matter to a bill that does not have anything to do with the matter at hand." I would simply say I have learned plenty from the majority leadership of this House about how to do that in the past few years, and I think we need to take advantage of that learning at this point to deal with what is a very serious problem facing our country on this question.

We need to have a policy on this so that we do not look as we did yesterday, like a bunch of chickens flying in all directions the minute an issue becomes controversial. We need to have a long-term policy to deal with this issue. The Sabo amendment, as it amends the Lewis amendment in the Appropriations Committee yesterday, would do that. And this bill before us today would be a decent venue to discuss that in a broad fashion, which is why I would urge defeat of the previous question so that we might be afforded the opportunity to offer such an amendment and have the House work its will on it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to hear from the vice chairman of the Committee on Government Reform about this important issue today, about ONDCP, is important. Today we have an opportunity to hear from the youngest member of the Republican leadership, newly elected chairman of our policy committee; a young man who is from Florida; a young man who has been in the thick of the battle of seeing not only the devastation of drugs but also what communities and what effective law enforcement can do in combating drugs. He is a young man who has an opinion. He is bringing that opinion to the Republican policy committee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), my colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, drugs are a scourge. It is a scourge that is not just an inner-city problem. It has spread like a cancer into our small towns, our suburban areas, farming communities, areas that used to view the war on drugs with a certain jaundiced eye as being somebody else's problem.

In Florida, unfortunately, we have been on the cutting edge of this war, beginning with the cocaine cowboys of the eighties, the dope runners who would use our airstrips and grassy areas to bring things in from the Caribbean and from Central America, and we have seen how it has ripped apart our communities.

We have seen how it has filled our schools with children with severe learning disabilities and developmental difficulties because of decisions that their parents made in using these terrible drugs, these highly addictive and dangerous chemicals. We have seen the costs that it has on society, and it is nothing short of a national tragedy. So I am pleased that there is such bipartisan concern for dealing with this scourge.

I am heartened by the bipartisan number of amendments that are being offered to try and improve upon this work of really giving the ONDCP the authority and the teeth that they need to continue to go after this. This Congress is working together to curtail the dangerous proliferation of drugs, and particularly that of methamphetamines. Meth abuse is where we really see a tremendous amount of growth outside of the cities, outside of those traditional areas where we have associated drug use.

My home district in central Florida is not what you would stereotypically think of as a high-drug trafficking area, a high-crime area. It is an area of suburban bedroom communities for larger cities and rolling citrus hills and cattle ranches. The largest city has less than 80,000 people in it. And yet it is, unfortunately, on the short list of major production areas for methamphetamine because of its rural nature, because they can have these labs in the middle of nowhere, where the stench from the creation of that terrible drug is not noticed.

In fact, the DEA says that meth has become the most dangerous drug problem of small-town America. They note that young people ages 12 to 14 who live in small towns are 104 percent more likely to use meth than young people living in larger cities. What a frightening statistic for people who think that they are escaping big-city problems when they move to smaller towns. Meth abuse is most prevalent in these rural areas, as we said, because you can set these labs up anywhere without detection, the more rural the area is.

My district has seen a huge spike in meth abuse, meth production, since the

nineties, which has a direct correlation to rising crime rates, overcrowded prisons and an impact on local law enforcement and local schools.

I appreciate the work of the Meth Caucus here in this Congress for continuing to bring attention to this epidemic of methamphetamine abuse. It is imperative that our Congress ensure that the Federal Government start treating this national problem with the same urgency and the same commitment that our State and local governments and grassroots advocacy groups have been treating it with for years.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule. I appreciate the hard work of Mr. SOUDER and Mr. SESSIONS and all the folks who have put so much into this, and I urge Members to support the underlying bill as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question so I can amend this rule to allow a vote today to block the President's plan to turn over our Nation's ports to a government-run company in Dubai.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. My amendment provides that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up legislation that does two things, undergirding what my good friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, mentioned in his remarks earlier.

First, it stops the President from moving forward with his deal to transfer operations at a number of our Nation's busiest ports, including the Port of Miami immediately south of my district, to the Government of Dubai state-owned Dubai Ports World. This is the identical language that was offered in the Appropriations Committee yesterday by Chairman LEWIS and later adopted by the committee on yesterday.

Secondly, the legislation would strengthen the process by which our government reviews future foreign takeovers. Specifically, it would require that all foreign transactions that could result in foreign control of any entity engaged in interstate commerce to undergo a thorough review that mandates the direct involvement of the President and the Congress. Whatever Members believe about the Dubai agreement, the House should be guaranteed an up-or-down vote on whether or not we want to turn control of a significant number of our Nation's ports over to a company that is owned by a foreign government.

This administration, without consulting the Congress, negotiated a se-

cret backroom deal to turn the management of our vital ports over to a foreign entity. The House must be involved in this process that directly affects our national security now and in the future. We are sent to Washington to protect this Nation and its citizens. We owe it to them to make sure this type of deal is never allowed to slip through the system again.

I want to emphasize that this vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the agenda of the Republican majority. A "no" vote will allow those of us concerned about the safety and security of America's ports to offer an alternative plan right here and right now.

□ 1100

It is a vote to consider homeland security priorities for the American people which the majority today has refused to consider.

I urge all Members to vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring up legislation that gives Congress the right to cast a vote and be heard on this matter of significant national security. I wish to repeat that: I urge all Members, both sides, to vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring up legislation so that we can do our job that gives Congress the right, just the right, to cast a vote and to be heard on this matter of significant national security.

Vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to be on the floor today to talk about the ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the reauthorization of that important act is why we are here today, and I do understand that the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin have some very strong feelings about some other issues that are not germane to the discussion of ONDCP.

I would also note that I am sure there will be a discussion today as we adjourn between the leadership parties, as they always meet on the floor to talk about thoughts, issues and ideas; and I am sure part of that discussion is going to be about the process that has been discussed through the Appropriations Committee, where there appears to be bipartisan agreement on moving forward on that important legislation.

However, today, I encourage all my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to maintain their focus on what the attempt is today, and that is to support the rule that reauthorizes ONDCP on behalf of America's families and for our future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by reminding my colleagues that defeating the previous question is an exercise in futility because the minority wants to offer an amendment that would otherwise be

ruled out of order as nongermane. So their vote or the request is really one without substance.

The previous question vote itself is simply a procedural motion to close debate on this rule that we are speaking about and proceed to vote on its adoption. The vote has no substantive policy implications whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, at this point I will insert in the RECORD an explanation of the previous question.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

House Rule XIX ("Previous Question") provides in part that:

There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered, shall have the effect of cutting off all debate and bringing the House to a direct vote on the immediate question or questions on which it has been ordered.

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 713—RULE PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a bill consisting of the text specified in Section 3 to prohibit the merger, acquisition, or takeover of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company by Dubai Ports World and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommend with or without instructions."

SEC. 3. The text referred to in section 2 is as follows:

A BILL

To prohibit the merger, acquisition, or takeover of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company by Dubai Ports World and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act or any other act may be used to take any action under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) or any other provision of law to approve or otherwise allow the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations of P&O Ports by Dubai Ports World or any other legal entity affiliated with or controlled by Dubai Ports World.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any prior action or decision by or on behalf of the President under section 721 of

the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170), the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations of P&O Ports by Dubai Ports World or any other legal entity affiliated with or controlled by Dubai Ports World is hereby prohibited and shall have no effect.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) and the prohibition in subsection (b) applies with respect to the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations on or after January 1, 2006.

(d) In this section:

(1) The term "P&O Ports" means P&O Ports, North America, a United States subsidiary of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, a company that is a national of the United Kingdom.

(2) The term "Dubai Ports World" means Dubai Ports World, a company that is partly owned and controlled by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and any prior action or decision by or on behalf of the President, the President shall exercise the authority under Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) to prohibit the merger, acquisition, or takeover of P&O Ports by Dubai Ports World.

(b) INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS.—Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 721. INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS.

"(a) INVESTIGATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving written notification, as prescribed by regulations under this section, of any merger, acquisition, or takeover proposed or pending on or after the date of the enactment of this section by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States, the President, acting through the President's designee and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall conduct an investigation to determine the effects, if any, of the proposed or pending merger, acquisition, or takeover on the national security of the United States.

"(2) TIMING.—Any investigation required under paragraph (1) shall be completed before the end of the 75-day period beginning on the date of the receipt by the President or the President's designee of written notification of the proposed or pending merger, acquisition, or takeover.

"(b) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any information or documentary material filed with the President or the President's designee pursuant to this section shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and no such information or documentary material may be made public, except as may be relevant to any administrative or judicial action or proceeding.

"(2) AVAILABILITY TO THE CONGRESS.—No provision of paragraph (1) shall be construed as preventing the disclosure of any information or documentary material to either House of Congress or to any duly authorized committee or subcommittee of the Congress.

"(c) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States established pursuant to Executive Order No. 11858 (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Committee') shall be a multi-agency committee to carry out this section and such other assignments as the President may designate.

"(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be comprised of the following members:

"(A) The Secretary of the Treasury.

"(B) The Secretary of State.

"(C) The Secretary of Defense.

"(D) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

"(E) The Attorney General.

"(F) The Secretary of Commerce.

"(G) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

"(H) The United States Trade Representative.

"(I) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

"(J) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

"(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the Chairperson of the Committee.

"(4) OTHER MEMBERS.—The Chairperson of the Committee shall involve the heads of such other Federal agencies, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, and the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy in any investigation under subsection (a) as the Chairperson determines to be appropriate on the basis of the facts and circumstances of the transaction under investigation.

"(5) ROLE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide appropriate intelligence analysis and intelligence briefings to the Committee.

"(d) ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No proposed or pending acquisition, merger, or takeover, of a person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by or with foreign persons may occur unless the President, on the basis of an investigation and report by the Committee, finds that such acquisition, merger or takeover, will not threaten to impair the national security of the United States, as defined by regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, and approves the transaction.

"(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The President shall direct the Attorney General to seek appropriate relief, including divestment relief, in the district courts of the United States in order to implement and enforce—

"(A) any finding, action, or determination under this section of disapproval of an acquisition, merger, or takeover; or

"(B) any conditions imposed on any approval of any acquisition, merger, or takeover.

"(3) FINALITY OF DETERMINATIONS.—All actions and determinations under this section shall be final and not subject to judicial review.

"(e) FINDINGS BY THE PRESIDENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A finding under this section of impairment or threatened impairment to national security shall be based on credible evidence that leads the President to believe that—

"(A) the foreign interest exercising control might take action that threatens to impair the national security; and

"(B) other provisions of law do not provide adequate and appropriate authority for the President to protect the national security.

"(2) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—Any investigation under this section shall take into account the following factors:

"(A) Domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

"(B) The capability and capacity of domestic industries to meet national defense requirements, including the availability of human resources, products, technology, materials, and other supplies and services.

"(C) The control of domestic industries and commercial activity by foreign citizens as it affect the capability and capacity of the United States to meet the requirements of national security.

"(D) The potential effects of the proposed or pending transaction on sales of military

goods, equipment, or technology to any country—

“(i) identified by the Secretary of State—“(I) under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country that supports terrorism;

“(II) under section 6(l) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country of concern regarding missile proliferation; or

“(III) under section 6(m) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country of concern regarding the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons; or

“(ii) listed under section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 on the ‘Nuclear Non-Proliferation-Special Country List’ (15 C.F.R. Part 778, Supplement No. 4) or any successor list.

“(E) The potential effects on the proposed or pending transaction on United States international technological leadership in areas affecting United States national security.

“(f) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Upon making any determination to approve or disapprove any merger, acquisition, or takeover by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States, the President shall immediately transmit to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a written report of the President’s determination under this section to approve or disapprove such merger, acquisition, or takeover, including a detailed explanation of the finding made and factors considered.

“(g) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the determination of the President contained in the report transmitted to the Congress under subsection (f) is that the President will approve any merger, acquisition, or takeover under subsection (d) and not later than 30 days after the date on which Congress receives the report, a joint resolution described in paragraph (2) is enacted into law, then the President shall take such action under subsection (d) as is necessary to prohibit the merger, acquisition, or takeover, including, if such acquisition has been completed, directing the Attorney General to seek divestment or other appropriate relief in the district courts of the United States.

“(2) JOINT RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘joint resolution’ means a joint resolution of the Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That the Congress disapproves the determination of approval of the President contained in the report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 721(f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 on _____’, with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

“(3) COMPUTATION OF REVIEW PERIOD.—In computing the 30-day period referred to in paragraph (1), there shall be excluded any day described in section 154(b) of the Trade Act of 1974.

“(h) REGULATIONS.—The President shall direct the issuance of regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall, to the extent possible, minimize paperwork burdens and shall to the extent possible coordinate reporting requirements under this section with reporting requirements under any other provision of Federal law.

“(i) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting any existing authority, power, process, regulation, investigation, enforcement measure, or review provided by any other provision of law.

“(j) TECHNOLOGY RISK ASSESSMENTS.—In any case in which an assessment of the risk of diversion of defense critical technology is performed by the Committee or any other

designee of the President, a copy of such assessment shall be provided to any other designee of the President responsible for reviewing or investigating a merger, acquisition, or takeover under this section.

“(k) BIENNIAL REPORT ON CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities with respect to this section, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall complete and furnish to the Congress, not later than May 1, 2007, and upon the expiration of every 2 years thereafter, a report, both in classified and unclassified form, which—

“(A) evaluates whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States companies involved in research, development, or production of critical technologies for which the United States is a leading producer; and

“(B) evaluates whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies aimed at obtaining commercial secrets related to critical technology.

“(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘critical technologies’ means technologies identified under title VI of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 or other critical technology, critical components, or critical technology items essential to national defense or security identified pursuant to this section.

“(1) BIENNIAL REPORT ON CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall complete and furnish to the Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and upon the expiration of every 2 years thereafter, a report, both in classified and unclassified form, which—

“(1) lists all critical infrastructure, as defined under subtitle B of Title II of Public Law 107-296, that is owned, controlled or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government;

“(2) evaluates whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States critical infrastructure; and

“(3) evaluates whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies controlling critical infrastructure.”

(b) APPROPRIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury as an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” for operation of the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, \$10,000,000.

(2) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The amount appropriated in this subsection is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

(3) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Any amount appropriated in this subsection may be transferred to any agency that is a core member of the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States in order for such agency to carry out its member responsibilities.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to the review and investigation of any acquisition, merger, or takeover which is or becomes subject to section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) (as in effect immediately before the date of the enact-

ment of this Act or on or after such date) that has not become final before the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Fossella	McCaul (TX)
Akin	Fox	McCotter
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	McCrery
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	McHenry
Baker	Gallely	McHugh
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon
Bartlett (MD)	Gibbons	McMorris
Barton (TX)	Gilchrest	Mica
Bass	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Beauprez	Gingrey	Miller (MI)
Biggart	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Goode	Moran (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Murphy
Blackburn	Granger	Musgrave
Blunt	Graves	Myrick
Boehert	Green (WI)	Neugebauer
Boehner	Gutknecht	Ney
Bonilla	Hall	Northup
Bonner	Harris	Nunes
Bono	Hart	Nussle
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Boustany	Hayes	Otter
Bradley (NH)	Hayworth	Oxley
Brady (TX)	Hefley	Paul
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Pearce
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Pence
Ginny	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Petri
Buyer	Hostettler	Pickering
Calvert	Hulshof	Pitts
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Poe
Campbell (CA)	Hyde	Pombo
Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Porter
Cantor	Issa	Price (GA)
Capito	Istook	Pryce (OH)
Carter	Jenkins	Putnam
Castle	Jindal	Radanovich
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Chocola	Johnson (IL)	Regula
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Reichert
Crenshaw	Keller	Renzi
Cubin	Kelly	Reynolds
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Kline	Royce
Dent	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Saxton
Doolittle	LaHood	Schmidt
Drake	Latham	Schwarz (MI)
Dreier	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Leach	Sessions
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
English (PA)	Linder	Sherwood
Everett	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Feeney	Lucas	Shuster
Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel	Simmons
Flake	E.	Simpson
Foley	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sodrel

Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry

Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hersteth
Higgins
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabó
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Townes
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—14

Burton (IN)
Conaway
Costa
Davis (FL)
Evans

Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Gonzalez
McKinney
Norwood

Salazar
Shays
Sweeney
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1128

Mr. TOWNS and Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 9, 2006, I missed rollcall vote No. 33, H. Res. 713, on ordering the previous question to provide for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 33.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we voted on the previous question on the rule for H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy. At the time that the vote was called, I was in the Energy and Commerce Committee participating in a hearing regarding the Department of Energy Budget. In my rush to go from the hearing to the House floor and for more meetings, I inadvertently voted “yes” on the previous question rather than “no” as I had intended.

While I know that my vote would not have changed the outcome of the previous question vote, I feel strongly that the House should be allowed the opportunity to consider legislation that would block the Dubai port deal and strengthen the review process for future foreign port deals I would like the RECORD to reflect that I intended to vote “no”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2829.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 713 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2829.

□ 1129

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1130

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act. Since its inception, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, better known as ONDCP, has been the cornerstone of drug policy in America, improving the lives of all Americans by reducing the presence of drugs in our society. This office has been producing results Americans need and want. Teen drug use is on the decline, and ONDCP deserves much of the credit for that.

ONDCP's success means we are faced not with the question of whether to reauthorize it, but how best to do so. The many positive signs and trends reported in this year's National Drug Control Strategy clearly demonstrate the difference the office can make with adequate resources and sound policy.

Drug use and abuse is a national crisis that affects the health of all of our citizens, and because of this ONDCP must remain an active body in the executive office. In order to win the war on drugs, we need to address the problem of drugs in our society from every single angle. This legislation gives ONDCP the appropriate resources to stop drug use before it starts, heal drug users, and disrupt drug markets.

We all know that drugs affect people from all walks of life. Addiction does not discriminate. A strong national drug policy is in the interest of every American. Mr. Chairman, this bill we bring to the floor today was crafted in true bipartisan fashion. It is a product of careful negotiations and strong bipartisan agreement. We aim to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President's strategy, making a strong office even stronger.

We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements required by law. The bill also improves ONDCP and its programs by enhancing effectiveness and accountability in drug treatment and requiring greater diligence in addressing our Nation's methamphetamine epidemic.

We also gave significant attention to reforms of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to make them more effective. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure the programs remain accountable and dedicated to their core purposes.

This bill recognizes the media campaign as an effective prevention tool and important element of the Federal Government's commitment to reducing teen drug use. We have all seen the well-known advertisements on subjects

such as drugs and terrorism, the consequences of marijuana use and parenting skills. These advertisements carry important messages to youth about the consequences of abuse and remind parents of the importance of keeping kids away from drugs. The media campaign works, and the message is being heard. It is preventing drug abuse before it starts.

When it comes to addressing the complex dilemma of drug addiction, prevention is only one part of the equation. Treatment of substance abuse and addiction is also essential. Because addiction has so many dimensions and disrupts multiple aspects of an individual's life, treatment is never easy. Drug users need the support of family, friends, and institutions to help guide them in treatment and recovery. This bill gives ONDCP the tools to maintain and strengthen programs so Americans who need help can receive it and begin on a path to recovery.

It also recognizes an important part of helping the addict is to remove the supply of drugs from our society. I have been to Colombia with Chairman SOUDER on numerous occasions. It is apparent to me that ONDCP is making every effort to attack the economic basis of the drug trade by disrupting markets at home and abroad. We need to continue to wage war on the supply side of the drug equation while reaffirming our commitment to addressing the demand side as well.

I want to thank Chairman SOUDER, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and my ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, for their leadership and hard work on this reauthorization legislation. I am happy we could reach bipartisan agreement on this bill since there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanship was reflected in a unanimous vote to pass this bill out of our committee.

I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation that gives ONDCP the necessary tools to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, trafficking, drug-related crime and violence and drug-related health consequences.

America's families need this legislation. I urge support of all of my colleagues for H.R. 2829 to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2829, which reauthorizes the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, including its National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, HIDTA, programs.

I want to begin by acknowledging the efforts of Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. They have worked

tirelessly to develop this legislation. They are true leaders in the fight against drug abuse. I would like to recognize Chairman DAVIS as well for the bipartisan way he has approached this issue.

Drug use is an enormous problem in our Nation, ruining lives, filling our prisons and sometimes terrorizing our communities. Many people are not even aware how drugs adversely affect them. In addition to those addicted and their families, drug abuse affects all of us. Theft and violent crime are closely tied to drug abuse. In addition, billions of dollars are spent on health care due to drug abuse, a burden to the entire Nation.

In order to combat illegal drug use, the Federal Government must attack from different avenues using many agencies of the government. For example, the State Department works with other countries. The Drug Enforcement Agency enforces drug laws. The Department of Health and Human Services must deal with breaking addiction. ONDCP's mandate is to coordinate all of these efforts in a comprehensive strategy, coordinating with State, local, and international governments and institutions.

The bill before us today ensures that there is one place in the Federal Government that combats all aspects of the drug problem through drug prevention, treatment, enforcement, interdiction, and supply reduction. ONDCP has a vital role to play in our efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on passage of this legislation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Chairman SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, and let me draw your attention to a specific section of the bill that I think is troubling not only to most Members of Congress but law enforcement throughout our country, and that is the increasing use and production of methamphetamines. This is a uniquely dangerous drug that is extremely addictive and ruins its victims. "Methamphetamine suddenly becomes this thing in their life that they cannot do without," stated Attorney General Alberto Gonzales. "In terms of damage to children and to our society, meth is now the most dangerous drug in America."

Consider the following facts: meth is the number one drug problem for the majority of county law enforcement agencies. According to the National Association of Counties, 58 percent of counties report that meth has become their top anti-drug priority for law enforcement. In many areas, meth cases are swamping hospital emergency rooms. In one NACO survey, 47 percent of hospitals said meth is the top illicit drug involved in patient presentation. The great majority of these patients are uninsured, placing a tremendous added burden on already strained emergency rooms.

As the meth epidemic spreads, other crimes are bred. Wherever meth gains a foothold, substantial increases in property crime are seen as addicts desperately seek cash to fund their addiction. In affected areas, a 62 percent increase in domestic violence due to meth has been reported.

Meth is a major cause of child abuse and neglect. Domestic meth labs create environments hazardous to children. A nationwide survey of child welfare officials has reported an increase of out-of-home placements because of meth just in the last year alone. In California, the figure is 80 percent.

Many States, and now the Federal Government through the Methamphetamine Epidemic Control Act, have taken decisive steps to strangle domestic meth production by cutting off the supplies of essential precursor chemicals like pseudoephedrine.

And with the passage of this law, we will also implement the following: require greater diligence on methamphetamine. The bill will require future installments of the National Drug Control Strategy to place greater emphasis on identifying emerging threats and properly preparing strategies to respond to such threats. This applies the lesson learned from the meth epidemic, which was allowed to spread from a regional to a national problem before any Federal response was made.

In this bill, we will target meth production through HIDTA. No less than \$15 million will be specifically set aside for law enforcement initiatives against meth trafficking.

Those provisions alone show why this bill is so critically important in its reauthorization. This will help law enforcement and counties, and we pray it will help families, because if you have seen any of the articles about the abuse of methamphetamines, you see how a thriving human being became addicted to this drug and has devastated their life and their future.

So we work together in a bipartisan way to see if we can help local governments eradicate this scourge among our society. I thank Chairman SOUDER and the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, for their team effort on solving some drug problems that face this country.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we stand here debating this important legislation before us today, illegal drug abuse, drug addiction, and drug-related violence are exacting an enormous toll on our society, destroying lives, tearing apart families and devastating entire communities. Nationwide, drug abuse will contribute to the loss of 50,000 lives, and more than 20,000 Americans will die as a direct consequence of illegal drug use this year alone.

In addition to the human toll, illegal drug abuse results in billions of dollars in cost to our Nation in health care costs and lost economic productivity,

placing an enormous burden on the American people, State and local governments, businesses and other institutions.

This set of circumstances is simply intolerable in a compassionate Nation, and it is our duty as the people's representatives to formulate laws and policies to reduce the scope and severity of this problem.

To be sure, America's drug problem is national in scope and has international dimensions. But its impact, first of all, is personal and local. In one way or another, every one of us and everyone we know is touched by this problem. Unfortunately, I see the tragedy of drug abuse and drug violence play out all too starkly in my own inner-city Baltimore neighborhood and in the communities of Baltimore and Howard counties that I represent. I have made a deliberate choice to continue to live where I do because I am determined to see our efforts here make a difference in my community for the benefit of the people I call my friends and neighbors and people like them across this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, no single event is more emblematic of the severe problems that inner-city Baltimoreans face than the horrific arson murder of Carmell and Angela Dawson and their five children in 2002. In the wee morning hours of October 16, 2002, a young drug dealer, upset with Angela Dawson's unrelenting efforts to report drug distribution activities occurring in front of her family's home, threw a fire bomb through the Dawsons' ground-floor window. The fire set the home ablaze, took seven lives, and sent a chilling message to the community: Don't snitch, don't cooperate with the police, and don't dare fight back.

The legislation we are considering today is a vital component of our Federal commitment to fight back against illegal drugs by mounting a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat all aspects of the drug problem through drug prevention, treatment, enforcement, interdiction and supply reduction.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy, the drug czar's office, was created in 1988 and has been reauthorized twice, in 1993 and 1998. Its basic mandate is to coordinate and support the efforts of drug control agencies located in eight different Departments.

□ 1145

H.R. 2829 would reauthorize the drug czar's office and three key programs administered by it: the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, HIDTA; the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center, CTAC; and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. HIDTA, CTAC, and the Media Campaign all play an important part in executing key aspects of the National Drug Control Strategy, and they deserve to be reauthorized.

H.R. 2829 was ordered reported by the Government Reform, Energy and Com-

merce, and Judiciary committees by voice vote with the bipartisan support of committee members. I am confident that this bill will strengthen ONDCP, its component programs, and our national comprehensive anti-drug effort by providing for increased interagency communication and cooperation, enhanced program and contractor accountability, and continuous evaluation of anti-drug programs and initiatives. This will result in more effective collaboration and let the administration, Congress, and the American people know in objective terms what approaches are working and what needs to be improved or rethought.

H.R. 2829 includes key bipartisan provisions that I strongly support, and most notably, the Dawson Family Community Protection Act. As amended by the manager's amendment adopted by the Judiciary Committee, this legislation, which I introduced with Chairman SOUDER in both the 108th and 109th Congresses, would annually provide at least \$7 million in HIDTA funds to support neighborhood safety and community cooperation with police in areas severely affected by violent drug-trafficking activity.

The Dawson provisions underscore the importance of the HIDTA program, which provides vital Federal funding to support uniquely flexible and effective collaboration between Federal, State, and local agencies. H.R. 2829 includes provisions to preserve and strengthen the HIDTA program in its current form and in its current location within ONDCP. This is in stark contrast to the administration's proposal, set forth in the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request, to reduce HIDTA funding and move HIDTA to the Department of Justice. H.R. 2829 reiterates Congress's intent that HIDTA should remain where it can be most effective.

H.R. 2829 also includes provisions to ensure that programs to expand access to drug treatment are adequately supported in the Federal drug control budget and further requires ONDCP to develop comprehensive strategies to address the severe threats posed by South American heroin, Afghan heroin, and drug smuggling across the Southwest border. In addition, H.R. 2829 calls for a comprehensive strategy for sharing and coordinating counterdrug intelligence and provides for increased coordination of interdiction assets and efforts.

With regard to the Media Campaign, the bill authorizes increased funding, recognizes pro bono advertising as the program's central component, provides for greater contractor accountability, requires testing and evaluation of ads before they appear on the air, and requires an independent evaluation of the campaign's impact on preventing and reducing illicit drug use by youth.

All in all, I believe this legislation advances the bipartisan, and I do emphasize that, bipartisan goal of supporting a strong, comprehensive, and coherent Federal anti-drug effort.

As the ranking minority member of the Government Reform's Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, I want to express my deep appreciation for the bipartisan support of Government Reform Committee Chairman TOM DAVIS of Virginia; ranking member HENRY WAXMAN; and Drug Policy Subcommittee Chairman MARK SOUDER. And I join them in strongly urging our colleagues to support this very important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Across America, individuals, families, and communities continue to be devastated by the scourge of drug abuse. It remains one of the most pressing and unforgiving problems our country faces.

Some have made comments, including on the floor earlier this morning, that we have made no progress in the war on drugs. That simply is not true. What we tend to do is go up and down as we do in any kind of battle. I do not believe we will ever get rid of the scourge of drug abuse any more than I believe we will get rid of what I believe is at its core, sin in other parts of America, whether it is spouse abuse, child abuse, rape.

But if we press and if we aggressively work together, we can reduce it. The fact is that when we backed off in the early 1990s and saw the Federal intervention dollars go down in the Andean region and the interdiction dollars go down, and the joke was even in prominent officials as "I didn't inhale," we saw drug use go up so much that we have to reduce it 50 percent from 1993 until now to get back to where we were in 1992. That dramatic rise and falling, again, is somewhat typical of what has happened in American history in drug abuse.

We have had some steady progress in key indicators. There is not meth abuse if you can get at marijuana use because all meth users use marijuana. Marijuana is the gateway drug, along with tobacco and alcohol in high school, of all other narcotics abuse. Right now we are facing a meth epidemic in the United States that clearly, I believe, this administration has not responded to nearly aggressively enough. We also have prescription drug abuse. Oxycontin and other prescription drugs are actually causing the most deaths from any drug abuse in the United States. We have to be eternally vigilant.

This bill, introduced by TOM DAVIS, the distinguished chairman of the Government Reform Committee, and me, along with the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and the full committee ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, is a forceful and bipartisan recommitment to our broad national efforts to control drug abuse and to renew our support for a strong Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Let me explain a couple of points about this. The ONDCP, Office of National Drug Control Policy, is often called the "drug czar." It was created by Congress. It was not created by an administration. It was taken somewhat unwillingly by an administration years ago, and now we are up for reauthorization. We attempted to reauthorize this several years ago. It passed the House unanimously, but never got through the Senate at the end of the year. We are now coming back with a bill that is bipartisan and bicameral. I believe that this bill now can move through the Senate.

It is important to remember a couple of reasons why it is important to authorize agencies, not just to appropriate. What has happened in this interim without an authorization is that the administration has attempted to gut the HIDTA program. They have attempted to wipe out many other programs. I believe they have lacked a national meth strategy. I believe that, in addition, they have failed to give better guidance to safe and drug-free schools and then proposed to zero it out; failed to give better guidance to State and local law enforcement and then proposed to zero out those programs.

What happens when you do not have an authorization bill is that it gives complete discretion to the administration to spend whatever funds we allocate in whatever way they choose. This was a Department created by the United States Congress, by both parties, by both Houses, and it is important we give guidance. When an administration refuses to respond to an issue like meth and refuses to use the office in the way Congress intended, you move from a bill that was the original authorization, like this, to a bill like this. In other words, you do get more micromanagement.

We have actually eliminated a number of subboards and appointments and things that were irrelevant, but there is much more direct guidance to try to make sure that you do not just criticize programs but that the drug czar, the director of ONDCP, directly gives guidance, whether it be on heroin in Afghanistan, whether it be in Colombia; that this will preserve the success of, for example, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas programs. If we pass this reauthorization bill, they will not be able to wipe it out or move it to other Departments.

The administration's proposal the last 2 years has been unanimously opposed by every HIDTA director in America. Every single HIDTA in America has opposed the administration's proposed changes. This authorization would keep HIDTA where it belongs. It will refocus the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This bill clarifies the purposes of the campaign. Some of this we have worked out with the administration in the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, where they were at odds a number of years ago and

they have implemented some of these changes; but we have now put it into law, because, remember, this is a 5-year reauthorization. This administration basically has 2 years to go. This is really outlining where the next administration is going to work in anti-drug policy, not just the current administration.

It will strengthen the Southwest border counternarcotics strategy. Many of us feel that there has been a lack of a coordinated Southwest border narcotics strategy, to say the least; and this bill will prescribe that there has to be a counternarcotics strategy. We will also target the methamphetamine epidemic. This bill requires at least \$15 million to be dedicated to combating meth in the HIDTAs.

We will also see a whole series of amendments. The United States Congress last year began asking for, and this year, a meth strategy. We have not had a meth strategy. We have had pathetic attempts, small attempts, at a meth strategy. But we have not had a national meth strategy. Amendment after amendment today, with the support of this subcommittee, will show the intensity of how this body feels on methamphetamines.

It will also rationalize the General Counter-Drug Intelligence Plan. We have had overlaps on intelligence that have been totally unacceptable and a waste of taxpayer dollars. It will elevate the rank and status of the ONDCP director. Because the director is tasked with coordinating drug control of numerous agencies, including Cabinet-level Departments, this bill designates that he has the same rank and status as a Cabinet officer. You cannot suggest to the State Department or the Defense Department that they are not doing enough, for example, in Afghanistan if you do not have equal status. It is absurd to think a staff person in the White House could have the same clout as a fellow Cabinet member in reviewing budgets, at least most of the time. This does not interfere with the President's authority to determine the makeup of his Cabinet, but it does ensure that the director will be able to work with the Department heads on an equal basis.

It will improve effectiveness and accountability in drug treatment. There is page after page to try to make sure that our drug treatment programs and that SAMSA work directly with the ONDCP director to do that and it does not become arbitrary. We have had some very disappointing lack of communication from the ONDCP director with SAMSA, and this will help correct that.

It also requires international drug control certification, which we believe is important. It will deal with Colombia, Afghanistan, including microherbicides.

We have many different amendments inside this bill that have been put together by Members of both parties. It is a truly bipartisan effort. When people say we cannot work together, here

is a truly bipartisan effort with the input of members from multiple committees. The reason this is in the Government Reform Committee is that 20-some subcommittees have jurisdiction over narcotics; and years ago when this office was created, it was put under Government Reform, normally an oversight committee but here with authorizing; and an increasing number of things were put under the drug czar so that we could coordinate it, and this bill will reestablish this because we have been frustrated that there has not been such clear coordination. This bill will mandate more directly that it is done.

I believe we have had some successes. We are having success in Colombia. Afghanistan, we are going backwards, but we are fighting hard. I believe that the DEA has done some good work in meth, but we need a lot more in meth. We need our national ad campaign and our HIDTAs to focus more on the meth epidemic. We have other different problems, and I believe that this bill is a comprehensive, bipartisan, bicameral way to try to address this.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been a leader in our efforts to address this problem of drug addiction in our country and certainly throughout the world.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS deserve a tremendous amount of credit.

I look at this problem, as a former mayor, as a criterion, one of the major criteria, for homeland security. If we cannot secure our neighborhoods, if we cannot secure our towns, small and large, against the poison of illicit drugs, which take many of our own sons and daughters every year, then we are never going to be able to address foreign terrorism on our shores.

□ 1200

So I thank you, and I thank you. I thank Mr. DAVIS and Mr. WAXMAN. I believe in a zero-tolerance policy, but we don't have a sense of urgency. Mr. SOUDER, I think you put it better than I could ever put it. This is an urgent problem, certainly nothing that started yesterday morning. It has been upon us.

The war on drugs is the original war on terror, one that we are fighting, and reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy is the least we can do, the least we can do, to continue the fight. I think it is a noble fight.

Illegal drug trafficking and use is a cancer on our society that destroys people, families, and even destroys neighborhoods. The bill takes a positive step in helping to restore the foundations of our community by authorizing more than \$1.1 billion over 4 years to fight drug trafficking in high-intensity areas. I happen to live in one of

those high-intensity areas, North Jersey/New York. This is an important investment that can be used by local, county, State and Federal agencies to collaborate information and root out the dealers and the traffickers.

In 2004, as a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, Secretary Ridge appeared before us. We were talking about terror and elevating the alerts, if you remember the debates we had at that time and the color schemes, et cetera, et cetera, which, by the way, we still have. And I asked Secretary Ridge, who I had a great deal of respect for, I thought he did a good job with the cards that he was dealt; I asked him the question, "Secretary Ridge, you were Governor of a State. Have you ever seen the terror on the faces of families and people who live in neighborhoods that are infested by drugs? Have you ever seen that terror?"

He said, "I know exactly where you are going, Congressman, because homeland security should be a place where we make our stand as well."

Families are being ruined. This bill increases funding for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, I think a successful program. The bill earmarks money for the Dawson Family Community Protection Act, which would focus on providing avenues for citizens to report drug trafficking in at-risk neighborhoods without putting their lives on the line.

This is an urgent problem, Mr. Chairman. This is a very urgent problem. When you see how many of our own kids are dying, and adults, I might say, during the year, and compare that against the tragedy of 9/11, we must address both of these problems to bring sanity back to our neighborhoods and back to our families.

There is an urgency here. Is there an urgency down the street, Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a former chairman of the subcommittee. He and I both were senior staffers in the other body and have worked on this issue for a long time. I appreciate his leadership in fighting narcotics throughout the United States.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair of this important subcommittee, Mr. SOUDER, for his leadership in bringing to the floor today probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider in this entire session of Congress. Not only do I thank him for his leadership and being a long-term soldier in this battle, but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, whom I have had the privilege to work with, who is also dedicated to dealing with this scourge on our Nation.

I say "scourge on our Nation," because we just heard the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, talk about what illegal narcotics and

drug abuse, substance abuse, has done to our Nation.

We have statistics. There are more than 20,000 American drug casualties a year. If we look at just the 3 years we have had the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have lost some 2,000 of our troops in service. We have lost more than 20,000 per year in our streets and neighborhoods, and those are only the recorded statistics. It is not all of the victims of crime and the murders. These are people who have died just from drug overdose in our communities, and many of them are our young people, the future of our Nation lost.

The cost in jails, incarceration, I am told 60 percent of those behind bars are there because of substance abuse. The social costs on all of our social agencies across this Nation is high.

Again, there is probably no greater social challenge that we have than the ravages of substance and drug abuse, child abuse, spouse abuse, all types of acts that we see that are almost unspeakable because of the effects of illegal narcotics.

I will say that President Bush and John Walters have done an excellent job in a number of areas. They set out measurable and accountable goals, and some of them have been achieved. We have seen a dramatic reduction in youth drug abuse. But we have a constant change in the challenge.

I know working with Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, we have seen the crack epidemic. We saw the heroin epidemic that ravaged Baltimore and other cities, great cities across the Nation. We have seen designer drugs. Now we see the meth scourge. So we have to have a flexible and adaptable policy. Hopefully this plan and the 5-year reauthorization provides that.

It is not always how much we spend, it is how we spend it. I think this administration has also focused attention on High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area designations, HIDTA, which we have done over the years, and we have set some of those in stone, and we keep funding them year after year. We need to look at how we spend that, how much we spend and where we put the resources for high-intensity approaches to going after problems that do shift and change. I think that is an important debate. I am not crazy about moving it over to the Department of Justice, but I do think we need a more accountable HIDTA program.

In conclusion, though, we do have a changing threat. We have seen some successes, as I said, with our youth. Plan Colombia, which we fought for during the nineties, we finally got implemented. It is an incredible success. We have some challenges to look forward to, the disruption in South America with people like Morales in Bolivia, whose policies raise great questions about the progress we have made in controlling illegal narcotics.

But we do know from our experience that we have to have a plan, we have to spend our money wisely, and hopefully

this reauthorization does that. We do know that we must focus on good education programs, up-to-date prevention programs, interdiction, strong enforcement programs, and then treatment programs that we also have measurable results from.

So I am pleased to join my colleagues in speaking for this reauthorization, and I hope that the final product will do even more in addressing this serious problem our society faces.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who is a member of our committee and who has worked on this issue, and is also a former mayor and very familiar with the drug issue in our country and in our cities.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the opportunity to address this.

We are all concerned about drug policy and about drug control policy. We are concerned about the impact drug addiction has on individual lives and families. We are concerned about the ripple effects of addiction on communities.

But I would just like to make this observation as we prepare to vote on this bill: We have to be careful in our strategy to ensure that we do not mistake victims for enemies. We make a mistake when students are punished both through the legal system and then by denying them critical education provisions, as the drug provision of the Higher Education Act does. The recent scaling back of that provision by this Congress is a step in the right direction, but we must do more. Denying students the opportunity for a higher education does not solve the Nation's drug problems, nor does it provide drug treatment.

We also make a mistake when we rely on randomized student drug testing to prevent addiction and abuse of drugs. Instead of focusing our efforts on educating our children about drugs and engaging them in the decisions about their lives and futures, drug testing assumes all youth are the same. Drug testing may be right in certain situations with reasonable evidence and a court order, but randomized testing renders all youths suspect and treats them as criminals. High expectations for our children may reap great rewards, but what will we sow with the expectation of deception? So we have to focus our efforts on helping our children, not punishing them, and we cannot allow the war on drugs to become a war on children.

I am sure there are many provisions of the bill before us that are aimed at helping many communities, but I just wanted to make this observation in general about our policies, so that as we get into a broader discussion on other legislation, that we pay close attention to the policies that we are considering or are enacting in our schools.

Mr. SOUDER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to my distinguished

colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership, along with Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. SOUDER, who I have had the pleasure of working with on these issues, both from the perspective of interdiction, along the "third border," but also from the perspective of homeland security as it relates to the northern and southern borders.

I rise to acknowledge and appreciate the great amount of work that has gone into this legislative initiative, and particularly as it relates to the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I recall that one of my first introductions to the severity of drug usage and the willingness to work full time on this issue was the opportunity to visit with Mr. CUMMINGS in his area, the city of Baltimore, which he was not reticent to let us know that there was a problem, and a problem, of course, that was connected to HIV/AIDS, and he has been working without ceasing to make great strides in the city of Baltimore. Mr. CUMMINGS, I want to congratulate you both for introducing Members of Congress to the crisis early on, as well your leadership in this area.

So I don't take away from this legislative initiative the importance of stemming the rising tide of drug usage. In fact, we had thought, I think, in some years past that there was a curving down. But for those who are listening to this debate and the many drug treatment centers around America and the addicted persons, I know that they are willing to admit that we still have a concern and a crisis, and the reauthorization of this particular agency is important for the work that it does.

In particular, as cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I see a frightening rise in the utilization of addictive substances by our children, particularly ages 12 to 17. We have seen a rising increase in the number of girls that are participating in drug usage, whether or not it is alcohol, starting in middle school; and we know that if you start taking substances like alcohol in middle school, by the time you reach the high school level you are addicted and we have a problem.

□ 1215

We know also that the scourge of cigarettes, though we find that the usage overall may be going down, is still attractive to children. You say no and they want to say yes.

And then, of course, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, we have consistently fought against the rising tide, the violent tide of methamphetamine use that started in our rural America, creeps into our cities; and the stories of blown up methamphetamine labs is a rage across America.

In fact, I remember one of the first legislative initiatives that I passed was

to stand against or to stop the use of a date-rape drug which was being made in bathtubs across America.

So this is an important response to that, and I hope that we will have an opportunity to accept my amendment on the floor that hopes to provide an assessment of where we are as it relates to intervention; to Federal and State programs that deal with assessing the use of drugs by children ages 12 to 17, a very simple premise; and as well wants to give greater guidance to Federal, State and local authorities as to how they intervene, what is the value, the success story.

I hope my colleagues will join me with that support. It is clearly a road map to help us be more effective. I also want to make mention of the fact that this is a homeland security issue, because I believe Mr. SOUDER participated in hearings dealing with utilization of drugs as money that can be laundered for terrorist activity.

We are particularly focused on those areas in our borders around America. So we need to stop the violent tide of drugs. In fact, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, we know that there are the combination of the smugglers of drugs with the huge cartels and the smugglers of human beings. They are intermixed and intertwined. They are there to do nothing but ill and evil. So these are important overlapping areas. I thank this committee for its leadership.

Let me mention an area, however, that I want to focus on, and I want to associate myself with Mr. KUCINICH and his concerns about the early incarceration, or trying juveniles as adults. That is why I want to have this assessment, because I believe it is important to be guided in the right procedures or right processes for our children, whether or not jail time, whether trying them as an adult is more effective than the intervention and good programs that are necessary.

Frankly, I think the good programs weigh more in stopping the tide of the utilization of drugs by our children. There should be some consideration to that.

And then let me, in conclusion, bring up Tulia, Texas, where, a, if you will, rogue cop was able to charge many, many of our constituents in Tulia, Texas, with false charges of drug use. In fact, most of the city found themselves charged with drug offenses down in the court house. This was a horrible episode of the utilization of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program.

This was an abuse that is beyond our appreciation. I am grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus and various leaders of that caucus who saw the injustices. No, we are not here to promote the proliferation of drug use, but we are here to cite some of the failings of the rogue activities that come out of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, where there were innocent individuals who were, if you will,

networked in, fish-netted in, conspiratorially grabbed into this whole drug conspiracy, mothers and uncles, brothers. Sometimes whole families were wrapped up in, indicted, tried and convicted, many of whom were serving jail time until we were able to get our hands on the investigation, lawyers were able to intervene, and the rogue cop was exposed and all of his testimony was discovered to be false.

So there needs to be an oversight and a concern about whether or not these are effective uses of our dollars and whether or not we can effectively have oversight, so that, yes, the drug dealers who are poisoning our community, real drug dealers, the cartels, the smugglers of drugs, the producers of methamphetamine labs, the sellers of prescription drugs for children to use and others, the abuse of cough medicine, all of that is important to be able to highlight, to indict, try and convict, but not to go in and use a fishnet, rely only on the testimony of a rogue cop and have no other evidence to be utilized and to break the backs, the hearts of families, and to destroy a community.

And so I hope that as we move this legislation forward, we will be able to be focused on the good items that are here, the direction that we can go with our children with an amendment that I have on the assessment of our programs; and, of course, Mr. CUMMINGS, thank you for the concern that when people are under this particular legislation, there is a basis for fairness and accuracy in any charges being made and that people are not singled out because of the color of their skin because they are associated with drug use.

With that, let me thank my colleagues for this legislation. I hope my words will be considered as we continue to debate this legislation and fight the war on drugs in a united and positive and successful manner.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very important piece of legislation. I think it was Mr. PASCRELL who said that we must act with a sense of urgency. And he was absolutely right. As we stand here today, there are so many people who are becoming addicted to drugs; there are people who are literally robbing their own relatives and robbing their neighbors to get the funds for drugs.

There are even people who are seeking drug treatment and finding it difficult to get that treatment. But what we have tried to do here today through this bill is to address this problem as best we could. One of the things that I must express appreciation for is Mr. SOUDER's candor with regard to this whole issue. Consistently, even when there were instances where the President's priorities seemed to be, and ONDCP's priorities seemed to be, a lit-

tle out of line with the things that we felt should be done to most effectively and efficiently address this problem, Mr. SOUDER, every step of the way stood up and said, look, we are going to do what is right.

We worked together very cooperatively. I really do appreciate it. It does mean a lot to me as a Member of this great body. I can say to all of our Members that this is legislation that we all should vote for. It should be a unanimous vote. I urge all Members to vote for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of comments I want to make in closing general debate here. One is, just for the record, though it is not part of this legislation, we have clearly corrected the misinterpretation of the student loan bill.

The Clinton administration had falsely interpreted the House legislation. The Bush administration continued to do that. It has been corrected. You only lose a student loan if you commit a drug crime while you have the loan.

That is the least that the taxpayers should expect; and even then, if you go to drug treatment and test clean, you can get your loan back. Even then, if you get convicted, not arrested, but convicted of a drug crime, you still can get it back after 2 years, or if you go through drug treatment and get clean.

The third time after you commit a drug crime and get convicted, then you lose your student loan. This is the least that the taxpayers should expect.

We also have this constant debate whether it is a war or a disease. Former drug czar Barry McCaffrey always said he felt it was both, and I agree. Because with heart disease you do not see doctors getting assassinated on the street. You do not see heart surgeons getting shot in deals about heart surgery.

Also it is a controllable disease. You do not have the equivalent of Alcoholics Anonymous or narcotics anonymous for Alzheimer's. But it is a disease. That is why treatment is very important. That is why the prevention programs are very important.

I appreciated Congressman PASCRELL, and actually it was Congressman CUMMINGS who first said that narcoterrorism is something that we live with every day.

As I said earlier, tragically, 3,500 people were killed on 9/11. But that fall, 7,500 died because of illegal narcotics; 30,000 in 2002; 30,000 in 2003; 30,000 in 2004; roughly 7,500 in the first quarter of this year 105,000 people have died.

While we get obsessed with every little thing going on in homeland security, we have terror on our streets, in our homes, and in our neighborhoods every day. We cannot forget and divert funds from the daily threat of narcoterrorism in the United States as we do this.

I want to again refer to the Government Reform Subcommittee report that was unanimously adopted today. You can find it on the Web site of the Criminal Justice Subcommittee under Government Reform, 154 pages, 607 footnotes. If you tap the footnote, you can get the actual source.

There you can get a full view of the whole narcotics policies, whether it is in HHS, Department of Justice, Defense, State Department. It is part of what we do in our committee.

The ONDCP, the direct bill in front of us, has two major functions. One is directly under the control of the so-called drug czar, the director of ONDCP. It is a national media campaign, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, and the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.

In addition, the drug czar reviews all budgets of all agencies with narcotics and has broad authority to make sure that we have a coordinated national drug policy, and this bill strengthens that.

This bill was not easily put together. I want to thank first off the Members of both parties. We have had an extraordinary working relationship and have become very close friends, Mr. CUMMINGS and I, but other members of our committee, too. We have had well-attended subcommittee hearings.

We have held field hearings as well as hearings in Washington. Our staff, particularly Nick Coleman, who has just recently left to go to the U.S. Attorney's Office, has visited almost every HIDTA in America.

We as Members have visited HIDTA directors here and have gone out and visited the different HDTAs. Marc Wheat, the staff director; Dennis Kilcoyne; Jim Kaiser; Tony Haywood from the minority staff have worked hard in developing this comprehensive legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS and I both thank our staff, because they help make us look good. In a bill this complicated, working with every agency in the Federal Government basically, in a bipartisan way, is not easy to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act, and I was pleased that the House Judiciary Committee adopted two amendments that I offered and that they are part of the base bill.

Street drug markets, such as open air drug dealing at the corner and at drug houses, are a serious public safety problem. Often located in poor, minority, and disadvantaged communities, they cause severe harm by easing initiation into drug use, supporting addiction, and by drawing youth into the drug trade.

My first amendment, which is designated Sec. 14 of H.R. 2829, provided for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales. This provision authorizes funding for demonstration programs that seek to coordinate an effective intervention using a credible,

deterrent message. This would encourage criminal justice agencies to collaborate with researchers and social welfare agencies to analyze local conditions and develop strategic, problem-solving interventions.

Such an approach was proven successful in High Point, NC. Upon identifying the drug market and its small group of active dealers, law enforcement carefully monitored and documented drug activity and probation/parole violations through surveillance and drug buys. Offenders with any violent criminal history were immediately arrested. Non-violent offenders, on the other hand, were confronted by law enforcement, city officials, service organizations and their families with a strong deterrent message. They were given a choice between facing immediate legal action or ceasing dealing and receiving rehabilitative services.

Consequently, the drug market promptly collapsed with minimal police intervention or crime displacement. Within one year of implementation, the drug crime rate of High Point fell by 34% and the violent crime rate was cut in half.

Sec. 14 of this bill authorizes \$10 million for the next three years to fund demonstration programs supporting these interagency collaborations. The agencies would be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the strategic intervention, and the Director would be responsible for submitting to Congress a report identifying the best practices in drug market eradication.

My second amendment, which is designated Sec. 15 of H.R. 2829, provided for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce abstinence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing and sanctions. This provision authorizes funding for demonstration programs that seek to reduce the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users living in the community while under the supervision of the criminal justice system.

Approximately 80 percent of the Nation's cocaine is consumed by a relatively small group of chronic users (approximately 4 million). Three-quarters of these users are under the supervision of the criminal justice system. By deterring these users, we would be able to reduce the nation's cocaine consumption by 60 percent—and these numbers are similar for other hard drugs, such as heroin and meth.

Coerced abstinence is a highly effective means for targeting these users. This model is based on predictable, frequent drug testing and known, non-negotiable, immediate, graduated sanctions. For example, a system where a participant is tested every 72 hours and a dirty test led to an immediate, unpleasant sanction—for example, 8 hours in a jury box or 24 hours in jail. Participants are simultaneously offered incentives such as drug treatment or other rehabilitative services.

An ongoing example of this model is being used in Hawaii, where substance abuse violations are common, with meth being the drug of choice. In October 2005, one year after the program began, program participants had an 83 percent reduction in positive test results (from 21.9% for control group to 3.8% for program participants) and an 87 percent reduction in missed appointments for testing (from 10% for control group to 1.3% for program participants).

This level of effectiveness we cannot ignore. For this reason, Sec. 15 of H.R. 2829 author-

izes \$10 million for the next 3 years for demonstration programs that administer drug tests to individuals at least twice a week and swiftly impose a known set of graduated sanctions for non-compliance. The program must include a plan for monitoring the progress toward reducing the percentage of positive drugs and missed testing appointments, and the Director would be responsible for submitting to Congress a report identifying the best practices in reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users.

I commend the Office of National Drug Control Policy for publicly committing itself to the goal of reducing illegal drug use and abuse in the United States. However, I also call on the Director to increase the allocation of funds dedicated for treatment and demand reduction efforts, which have shown to be very successful in reducing drug use. To achieve this national drug control policy that efficiently reduces drug use and abuse in the United States, we need strategies that are as smart as they are tough. This requires that we remain open to evidence-based programs and respond with innovation. I commend ONDCP for the progress it has made, ask that the Director consider these recommendations and will support this legislation, H.R. 2829, to the reauthorize the Office.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, as we work to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy today, I'd like to pay tribute to the work and dedication of Southwest Michigan's Regional Methamphetamine Taskforces. It is through their efforts that March is Methamphetamine Awareness Month in Southwest Michigan.

The unfortunate reality is that each and every one of our communities is vulnerable to the dangers of meth—it is a highly addictive drug that does not discriminate. However, the communities of Southwest Michigan are united in their fight against this epidemic. Regional meth taskforces consisting of dedicated law enforcement officials, pharmacists, firefighters, right down to the individual neighborhood watchman, are making headway in the fight against meth. This drug epidemic must be fought on the front lines, and the troops are assembled in Southwest Michigan.

I applaud the efforts of our dedicated Regional Meth Taskforce coordinators: Heidi Bertschinger of Allegan, Liz Lenz of Barry, Kim Palchak of Branch, Jennifer Lester of Cass, Tina Harbaugh of Kalamazoo, Mike Wilson of St. Joseph, and E.J. McAndrew of Van Buren. I would also like to commend Rick Shanley of Kalamazoo for increasing public awareness of the progress that the task forces are accomplishing.

These folks, and many others who follow their lead, have worked diligently to educate communities on the dangers of this drug. Among their many contributions to our region, the taskforces have trained community members to recognize the warning signs of the meth production and addiction, conducted research used by local treatment providers and educated school groups. Our communities are better off for the efforts of our regional taskforces.

Special thanks also goes out to all of our local law enforcement officials, they face the dangers associated with meth abuse each and every day. While March is Methamphetamine Awareness Month in Southwest Michigan, this is a problem that must be addressed each and

every month of the year, until it has been conquered.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, when I am home in Utah, I constantly hear about the prevalence of methamphetamines and the dangers to our community posed by this highly addictive drug. This legislation has some excellent measures to help the federal government better deal with the problem and I sincerely hope that it will help ONDCP to combat meth abuse.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) was created in 1988 in order to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for our Nation's drug control program. Its stated goals are to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, and trafficking, drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences. I support this bill and am proud to vote for strengthening the agency in charge of producing the National Drug Control Strategy.

But it would be a mistake to look at this bill without also considering the need to fully fund local law enforcement. The drug problem in our nation and in my home State of Utah is so pervasive that it absolutely requires the dedication and the cooperative efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement. I know that Utah is not alone—I've heard many of my colleagues talk today about the scourge of methamphetamines and other drugs in thousands of communities across the nation. As a result, I am gravely concerned about the President's budget proposal for funding local law enforcement.

The federal government needs to step up to the plate and properly fund law enforcement, if we are serious about national drug control policy. That's why I strongly support funding for critical law enforcement programs, such as Byrne grants, JAG grants, and the COPS program. During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made it a point to share with me exactly how these grants help protect Utah citizens.

As we vote today to reauthorize ONDCP, let us also remember that our commitment to safeguarding local communities. I don't think we can say enough about the men and women who use this funding to better patrol our streets, decrease the availability of drugs in our schools, and ensure that each and every citizen is safe and protected. I know that they, and their fellow officers across this nation, are committed to protecting all of us, just as I am committed to working in support of both homeland security and domestic security.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit the attached exchange of letters between Chairman BUCK McKEON of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Chairman PETER HOEKSTRA of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Chairman JAMES SENSENBRENNER of the Committee on Judiciary, and myself for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 2829, the "Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005," the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 2829, including intelligence and intelligence-related provisions contained in the bill.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the House debate on H.R. 2829. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PETER HOEKSTRA,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. HOWARD PETER HOEKSTRA,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Permanent Select Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2829, the *Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005*. As you have stated, your committee has a valid jurisdiction interest in the intelligence and intelligence-related provisions contained in the bill.

Thank you for waiving further consideration of H.R. 2829. I agree that waiving further consideration of this bill does not prejudice the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee nor should it be considered as precedent for matters of jurisdictional interest in the future. In addition, I will support your request for conferees from your committee should a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 2829.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE
WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 2829, the *Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005*, which the Committee on Government Reform reported on November 18, 2005. The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and in addition to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary. In the bill as reported by the Committee on Government Reform, Title II, the *Clean Sports Act*, specifically the provi-

sions relating to high schools and collegiate athletics (proposed sections 21 U.S.C. §§ 725, 729, and 730) is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Given the fact that the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 2, 2006, which does not contain the *Clean Sports Act*, will be the base text considered by the House, I do not intend to ask for continued referral of H.R. 2829. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on Education and the Workforce's jurisdictional interest and prerogative on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. Furthermore, should these or similar provisions be considered in a conference with the Senate, I would expect members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce be appointed to the conference committee on these provisions.

Finally I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this bill. If you have questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Education and the Workforce Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2829, the *Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005*. As you have stated, the provisions relating to high schools and collegiate athletics in Title II, the *Clean Sports Act*, as reported by my Committee are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Thank you for not requesting the continued referral of H.R. 2829. It is correct that the version of H.R. 2829, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, that will be considered in the House does not contain the *Clean Sports Act* or other provisions related to collegiate and high school athletics. I agree that not considering this bill in committee does not prejudice the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Workforce Committee nor should it be considered as precedent for matters of jurisdictional interest in the future. In addition, I would support your request for conferees from your Committee should a House-Senate conference on these or similar provisions be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 2829.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 2829, the "Office of

National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005," on the House floor. The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and in addition to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

Thanks to your cooperation and diligent efforts to improve H.R. 2829, the bill, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, represents the legislative text that will be the basis for consideration by the House. I have therefore agreed to make in order the version of the bill reported by your committee. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest and prerogatives of the Committee on Government Reform and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your confirmation of our mutual understanding. I will include a copy of our exchange of letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this bill. If you have questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 2829, the "Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005," on the floor. I agree that the version of H.R. 2829 reported by the Committee on the Judiciary represents the text that should be considered on the House floor, and it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules will make in order the version of the bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. I agree that this procedural route does not prejudice the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Government Reform.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your Committee's diligent work on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization. Other than the TSA making grandmothers take off their shoes and infants discard their milk bottles prior to boarding airplanes, the War on Drugs might go down in history as the most ineffective program in the history of the United States.

We spend over \$40 billion per year on the drug war and at least another \$30 billion to keep over one million Americans in prison on drug charges. Yet, study after study shows that drugs are as readily available as ever and drug use rates have remained unchanged for the last decade. Incarcerating one person costs at least \$30,000 per year, while a comprehensive residential drug treatment program costs about \$7,000. Treating drug addiction as a criminal rather than medical problem is not only scientifically unsound—it's a waste of money.

If we're going to spare no dollar in the war on drugs, then let's have quality education and after-school options for every child in America. And let's reverse the diabolical and failed policy of denying college loans to students with prior drug offenses. Americans with drug problems obviously need more—not fewer—opportunities to change their lives for the better.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this senseless, wasteful Office of National Drug Control Policy. Let's redirect these dollars to programs that work rather than "tough on crime" soundbites and countless useless government reports that do nothing to reduce drug use or addiction.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2829

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Amendment of Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998.
- Sec. 3. Repeal of termination provision.
- Sec. 4. Amendments to definitions.
- Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy and designation of officers.
- Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment and duties of Director and Deputy Director.
- Sec. 7. Amendments relating to coordination with other agencies.
- Sec. 8. Development, submission, implementation, and assessment of National Drug Control Strategy.
- Sec. 9. High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.
- Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
- Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
- Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
- Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
- Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
- Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce abstinence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing and sanctions.
- Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.

Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertising or other communication materials.

Sec. 19. Policy relating to syringe exchange programs.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277; 21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF TERMINATION PROVISION.

Section 715 (21 U.S.C. 1712) is repealed, and the law shall read as if such section was never in effect.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.**—Section 702 (21 U.S.C. 1701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (F);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (G) and inserting ", including the testing of employees;"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(H) interventions for drug abuse and dependence; and

"(I) international drug control coordination and cooperation with respect to activities described in this paragraph.";

(2) in paragraph (6), by adding before the period at the end: ", including any activities involving supply reduction, demand reduction, or State and local affairs";

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking "Agency" and inserting "agency";

(B) by striking "National Foreign Intelligence Program," and inserting "National Intelligence Program,"; and

(C) by inserting a comma before "or Tactical";

(4) in paragraph (9), by striking "implicates" and inserting "indicates";

(5) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by adding "National Drug Control Program agencies and" after "among" in subparagraph (B);

(B) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) domestic drug law enforcement, including domestic drug interdiction and law enforcement directed at drug users; and

"(E) coordination and enhancement of Federal, State, and local law enforcement initiatives to gather, analyze, and disseminate information and intelligence relating to drug control among domestic law enforcement agencies.";

(6) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by inserting before the semicolon in subparagraph (A) the following: ", including—

"(i) law enforcement outside the United States; and

"(ii) source country programs, including economic development programs primarily intended to reduce the production or trafficking of illicit drugs";

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) facilitating and enhancing the sharing of foreign and domestic information and law enforcement intelligence relating to drug production and trafficking among National Drug Control Program agencies, and between those agencies and foreign law enforcement agencies; and";

(C) by striking "; and" at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—Except where otherwise provided, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

"(13) **LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—The term 'law enforcement' or 'drug law enforcement' means all efforts by a Federal, State, or local government agency to enforce the drug laws of the United States or any State, including investigation, arrest, prosecution, and incarceration or other punishments or penalties."

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 703(b)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(G)" and inserting "(I)"; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking "through (C)" and inserting "through (E)";

(B) by striking "and subparagraph (D) of section 702(11)"; and

(C) by adding before the period at the end the following: ", and sections 707 and 708 of this Act".

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY AND DESIGNATION OF OFFICERS.

(a) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Paragraph (4) of section 703(a) (21 U.S.C. 1702(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) evaluate the effectiveness of the national drug control policy and the National Drug Control Program agencies' programs, by developing and applying specific goals and performance measurements."

(b) **RANK OF DIRECTOR.**—Section 703(b) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)) is amended in paragraph (1) by adding before the period the following: ", who shall hold the same rank and status as the head of an executive department listed in section 101 of title 5, United States Code".

(c) **DEPUTY DIRECTORS.**—Section 703(b) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)) is amended in paragraph (3)—

(1) by striking "Office—" and inserting "Office the following additional Deputy Directors—"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "who shall" and inserting the following: "who shall have substantial experience and expertise in drug interdiction operations and other supply reduction activities, and who shall serve as the United States Interdiction Coordinator and".

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO APPOINTMENT AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF OTHER OFFICERS.**—Section 704(a)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "permanent employee" and inserting "officer or employee"; and

(2) by striking "serve as the Director" and inserting "serve as the acting Director".

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.**—Section 704(b) (21 U.S.C. 1703(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking "Federal departments and agencies engaged in drug enforcement," and inserting "National Drug Control Program agencies,";

(2) in paragraph (7), by inserting after "President" the following: "and the appropriate congressional committees";

(3) in paragraph (13), by striking "(beginning in 1999)";

(4) in paragraph (14)—

(A) by striking "Appropriations" and all that follows through "Senate" and inserting "appropriate congressional committees"; and

(B) by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(5) in paragraph (15), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) supporting the substance abuse information clearinghouse administered by the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental

Health Services Administration and established in section 501(d)(16) of the Public Health Service Act by—

“(i) encouraging all National Drug Control Program agencies to provide all appropriate and relevant information; and

“(ii) supporting the dissemination of information to all interested entities;”;

(6) by inserting at the end the following:

“(16) shall coordinate with the private sector to promote private research and development of medications to treat addiction;

“(17) shall seek the support and commitment of State and local officials in the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(18) shall monitor and evaluate the allocation of resources among Federal law enforcement agencies in response to significant local and regional drug trafficking and production threats;

“(19) shall submit an annual report to Congress detailing how the Office of National Drug Control Policy has consulted with and assisted State and local governments with respect to the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy and other relevant issues; and

“(20) shall, within one year after the date of the enactment of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005, report to Congress on the impact of each Federal drug reduction strategy upon the availability, addiction rate, use rate, and other harms of illegal drugs.”.

(c) SUBMISSION OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—Section 704(c)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CONTENT OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—A drug control budget request submitted by a department, agency, or program under this paragraph shall include all requests for funds for any drug control activity undertaken by that department, agency, or program, including demand reduction, supply reduction, and State and local affairs, including any drug law enforcement activities. If an activity has both drug control and nondrug control purposes or applications, the department, agency, or program shall estimate by a documented calculation the total funds requested for that activity that would be used for drug control, and shall set forth in its request the basis and method for making the estimate.”.

(d) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL BUDGET PROPOSAL.—Section 704(c)(2) is amended in subparagraph (A) by inserting before the semicolon: “and to inform Congress and the public about the total amount proposed to be spent on all supply reduction, demand reduction, State and local affairs, including any drug law enforcement, and other drug control activities by the Federal Government, which shall conform to the content requirements set forth in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection”.

(e) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM BUDGET.—Section 704(c)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SPECIFIC REQUESTS.—The Director shall not confirm the adequacy of any budget request that—

“(i) requests funding for Federal law enforcement activities that do not adequately compensate for transfers of drug enforcement resources and personnel to law enforcement and investigation activities not related to drug enforcement as determined by the Director;

“(ii) requests funding for law enforcement activities on the borders of the United States that do not adequately direct resources to drug interdiction and enforcement as determined by the Director;

“(iii) requests funding for drug treatment activities that do not provide adequate result and

accountability measures as determined by the Director;

“(iv) requests funding for any activities of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program that do not include a clear antidrug message or purpose intended to reduce drug use;

“(v) requests funding to enforce section 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) with respect to convictions for drug-related offenses not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the student was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance;

“(vi) requests funding for drug treatment activities that do not adequately support and enhance Federal drug treatment programs and capacity, as determined by the Director;

“(vii) requests funding for fiscal year 2007 for activities of the Department of Education, unless it is accompanied by a report setting forth a plan for providing expedited consideration of student loan applications for all individuals who submitted an application for any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance that was rejected or denied pursuant to 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) by reason of a conviction for a drug-related offense not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the individual was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance; and

“(viii) requests funding for the operations and management of the Department of Homeland Security that does not include a specific request for funds for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement to carry out its responsibilities under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 458).”;

(3) in subparagraph (D)(iii), as so redesignated, by inserting “and the appropriate congressional committees” after “House of Representatives”; and

(4) in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II)(bb), as so redesignated, by inserting “and the appropriate congressional committees” after “House of Representatives”.

(f) REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER REQUESTS.—Section 704(c)(4)(A) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

(g) POWERS OF DIRECTOR.—Section 704(d) (21 U.S.C. 1703(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(D), by striking “have been authorized by Congress;” and inserting “authorized by law;”;

(2) in paragraph (9)—

(A) by inserting “notwithstanding any other provision of law,” after “(9)”; and

(B) by striking “Strategy; and” and inserting “Strategy and notify the appropriate congressional committees of any fund control notice issued;”;

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking “(22 U.S.C. 2291j).” and inserting “(22 U.S.C. 2291j) and section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1); and”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) not later than August 1 of each year, submit to the President a report, and transmit copies of the report to the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees, that—

“(A) provides the Director’s assessment of which countries are major drug transit countries or major illicit drug producing countries as defined in section 481(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e));

“(B) provides the Director’s assessment of whether each country identified under subparagraph (A) has cooperated fully with the United States or has taken adequate steps on its own to achieve full compliance with the goals and objectives established by the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and otherwise has assisted in reducing the supply of illicit drugs to the United States; and

“(C) provides the Director’s assessment of whether application of procedures set forth in section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j), as provided in section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1), is warranted with respect to countries the Director assesses have not cooperated fully.”.

(g) FUND CONTROL NOTICES.—Section 704(f) (21 U.S.C. 1703(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—A copy of each fund control notice shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

“(5) RESTRICTIONS.—The Director shall not issue a fund control notice to direct that all or part of an amount appropriated to the National Drug Control Program agency account be obligated, modified, or altered in any manner contrary, in whole or in part, to a specific appropriation or statute.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 704 (21 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “National Foreign Intelligence Program” and inserting “National Intelligence Program”; and

(B) by inserting a comma before “and Tactical”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency”.

(i) REQUIREMENT FOR SOUTH AMERICAN HEROIN STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from South American heroin, and in particular Colombian heroin and the emerging threat from opium poppy grown in Peru and often intended for transit to Columbia for processing into heroin.

(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) opium eradication efforts to eliminate the problem at the source to prevent heroin from entering the stream of commerce;

(B) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(C) demand reduction and treatment;

(D) alternative development programs, including direct assistance to regional governments to demobilize and provide alternative livelihoods to former members of insurgent or other groups engaged in heroin, coca, or other illicit drug production or trafficking;

(E) efforts to inform and involve local citizens in the programs described in subparagraphs (A) through (D), such as through leaflets advertising rewards for information;

(F) provisions that ensure the maintenance at current levels of efforts to eradicate coca in Colombia; and

(G) assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary to simultaneously address the threat from South American heroin and the threat from Colombian and Peruvian coca.

(3) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant Federal agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, foreign, or international agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(j) REQUIREMENT FOR AFGHAN HEROIN STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from Afghan heroin.

(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) opium crop eradication efforts to eliminate the problem at the source to prevent heroin from entering the stream of commerce;

(B) destruction or other direct elimination of stockpiles of heroin and raw opium, and heroin production and storage facilities;

(C) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(D) demand reduction and treatment;

(E) alternative development programs;

(F) measures to improve cooperation and coordination between Federal Government agencies, and between such agencies, agencies of foreign governments, and international organizations with responsibility for the prevention of heroin production in, or trafficking out of, Afghanistan; and

(G) an assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary significantly to reduce the production and trafficking of heroin.

(3) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant Federal agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, foreign, or international agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(k) REQUIREMENT FOR GENERAL COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than every two years thereafter, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, a general counterdrug intelligence plan to improve coordination, and eliminate unnecessary duplication, among the counterdrug intelligence centers and information sharing systems, and counterdrug activities of the Federal Government, including the centers, systems, and activities of the following departments and agencies:

(A) The Department of Defense, including the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the joint interagency task forces.

(B) The Department of the Treasury, including the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN).

(C) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(D) The National Security Agency.

(E) The Department of Homeland Security, including the United States Coast Guard, the bureau of Customs and Border Protection, and the bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(F) The Department of Justice, including the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC); the Drug Enforcement Administration, including the El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC); the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force; and the Regional Information Sharing System.

(G) The Office of National Drug Control Policy, including the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.

(H) The Counterdrug Intelligence Executive Secretariat.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the plan under paragraph (1) is to maximize the effectiveness of the centers and activities referred to in that paragraph in achieving the objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy promulgated under 21 U.S.C. 1705. In order to maximize such effectiveness, the plan shall—

(A) articulate clear and specific mission statements (including purpose and scope of activity) for each counterdrug intelligence center, system, and activity, including the manner in which responsibility for counterdrug intelligence activities will be allocated among the counterdrug intelligence centers and systems;

(B) specify each government agency (whether Federal, State, or local) that participates in

each such center, system, and activity, including a description of the extent and nature of that participation;

(C) specify the relationship between such centers, systems, and activities;

(D) specify the means by which proper oversight of such centers, systems, and activities will be assured;

(E) specify the means by which counterdrug intelligence and information will be forwarded effectively to all levels of officials responsible for United States counterdrug policy; and

(F) specify mechanisms to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies are apprised of counterdrug intelligence and information acquired by Federal law enforcement agencies in a manner which—

(i) facilitates effective counterdrug activities by State and local law enforcement agencies; and

(ii) provides such State and local law enforcement agencies with the information relating to the safety of officials involved in their counterdrug activities.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection—

(A) the term “center” refers to any center, office, task force, or other coordinating organization engaged in counterdrug intelligence or information analyzing or sharing activities;

(B) the term “system” refers to any computerized database or other electronic system used for counterdrug intelligence or information analyzing or sharing activities; and

(C) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(i) The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(ii) The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(4) LIMITATION.—The general counterdrug intelligence plan shall not—

(A) change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws; or

(B) include any information about specific methods of obtaining, or sources of, intelligence or information, or any information about specific individuals, cases, investigations, or operations.

(5) CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the general counterdrug intelligence plan that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Director of National Intelligence, or the head of any Federal Government agency whose activities are described in the plan, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the report.

(1) REQUIREMENT FOR SOUTHWEST BORDER COUNTERNARCOTICS STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every two years thereafter, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy.

(2) PURPOSES.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall—

(A) set forth the Government's strategy for preventing the illegal trafficking of drugs across the international border between the United States and Mexico, including through ports of entry and between ports of entry on that border;

(B) state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program

agencies (as defined in section 702 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701)) for implementing that strategy; and

(C) identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies to implement that strategy.

(3) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Director shall issue the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy in consultation with the heads of the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies.

(4) LIMITATION.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall not change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws.

(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall provide a copy of the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 702 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701)), and to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(6) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(m) REQUIREMENT FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF MYCOHERBICIDE IN ILLICIT DRUG CROP ERADICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a report that includes a plan to conduct, on an expedited basis, a scientific study of the use of mycoherbicide as a means of illicit drug crop elimination by an appropriate Government scientific research entity, including a complete and thorough scientific peer review. The study shall include an evaluation of the likely human health and environmental impacts of such use. The report shall also include a plan to conduct controlled scientific testing in a major drug producing nation of mycoherbicide naturally existing in the producing nation.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.

Section 705 (21 U.S.C. 1704) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “abuse”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”;

(3) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency”;

(4) by amending paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(3) REQUIRED REPORTS.—

“(A) SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall, by July 1 of each year, jointly submit to the Director, the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, an assessment of the quantity of illegal drug cultivation and manufacturing in the United States on lands owned or under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government for the preceding year.

“(B) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the

Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding the number and type of—

- “(i) arrests for drug violations;
- “(ii) prosecutions for drug violations by United States Attorneys; and
- “(iii) seizures of drugs by each component of the Department of Justice seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures.

“(C) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the Director, the appropriate congressional committees, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, information for the preceding year regarding—

- “(i) the number and type of seizures of drugs by each component of the Department of Homeland Security seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures; and
- “(ii) the number of air and maritime patrol hours undertaken by each component of that Department primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions.

“(D) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the Director, the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, information for the preceding year regarding the number of air and maritime patrol hours primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions undertaken by each component of the Department of Defense.”

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking “Program.” and inserting “Strategy.”; and

(6) in subsection (c), by striking “in” and inserting “on”.

SEC. 8. DEVELOPMENT, SUBMISSION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.

Section 706 (21 U.S.C. 1705) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 706. DEVELOPMENT, SUBMISSION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.

“(a) TIMING, CONTENTS, AND PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the President shall submit to Congress a National Drug Control Strategy, which shall set forth a comprehensive plan for reducing illicit drug use and the consequences of illicit drug use in the United States by reducing the demand for illegal drugs, limiting the availability of illegal drugs, and conducting law enforcement activities with respect to illegal drugs.

“(2) CONTENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Drug Control Strategy submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(i) Comprehensive, research-based, long-range, and quantifiable goals for reducing illicit drug use and the consequences of illicit drug use in the United States.

“(ii) Annual quantifiable objectives for demand reduction, supply reduction, and law enforcement activities, specific targets to accomplish long-range quantifiable reduction in illicit drug use as determined by the Director, and specific measurements to evaluate progress toward the targets and strategic goals.

“(iii) A strategy to reduce the availability and purity of illegal drugs and the level of drug-related crime in the United States.

“(iv) An assessment of Federal effectiveness in achieving the National Drug Control Strategy for the previous year, including a specific evaluation of whether the objectives and targets for reducing illicit drug use for the previous year were met and reasons for the success or failure of the previous year’s Strategy.

“(v) A general review of the status of, and trends in, international, State, and local drug control activities to ensure that the United States pursues well-coordinated and effective drug control at all levels of government.

“(vi) A general review of the status of, and trends in, demand reduction activities by private sector entities and community-based organizations, including faith-based organizations, to determine their effectiveness and the extent of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between such entities and organizations and Federal, State, and local government agencies.

“(vii) An assessment of current illicit drug use (including inhalants and steroids) and availability, impact of illicit drug use, and treatment availability, which assessment shall include—

“(I) estimates of drug prevalence and frequency of use as measured by national, State, and local surveys of illicit drug use and by other special studies of nondependent and dependent illicit drug use;

“(II) illicit drug use in the workplace and the productivity lost by such use; and

“(III) illicit drug use by arrestees, probationers, and parolees.

“(viii) An assessment of the reduction of illicit drug availability, as measured by—

“(I) the quantities of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine, ecstasy, and other drugs available for consumption in the United States;

“(II) the amount of marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, ecstasy, and precursor chemicals and other drugs entering the United States;

“(III) the number of illicit drug manufacturing laboratories seized and destroyed and the number of hectares of marijuana, poppy, and coca cultivated and destroyed domestically and in other countries;

“(IV) the number of metric tons of marijuana, heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine seized and other drugs; and

“(V) changes in the price and purity of heroin, methamphetamine, and cocaine, changes in the price of ecstasy, and changes in tetrahydrocannabinol level of marijuana and other drugs.

“(ix) An assessment of the reduction of the consequences of illicit drug use and availability, which shall include—

“(I) the burden illicit drug users place on hospital emergency departments in the United States, such as the quantity of illicit drug-related services provided;

“(II) the annual national health care cost of illicit drug use; and

“(III) the extent of illicit drug-related crime and criminal activity.

“(x) A general review of the status of, and trends in, of drug treatment in the United States, by assessing—

“(I) public and private treatment utilization; and

“(II) the number of illicit drug users the Director estimates meet diagnostic criteria for treatment.

“(xi) A review of the research agenda of the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center to reduce the availability and abuse of drugs.

“(xii) A summary of the efforts made by Federal agencies to coordinate with private sector entities to conduct private research and development of medications to treat addiction by—

“(I) screening chemicals for potential therapeutic value;

“(II) developing promising compounds;

“(III) conducting clinical trials;

“(IV) seeking, where appropriate, Food and Drug Administration approval for drugs to treat addiction;

“(V) marketing, where appropriate, the drug for the treatment of addiction;

“(VI) urging physicians, where appropriate, to use the drug in the treatment of addiction; and

“(VII) encouraging, where appropriate, insurance companies to reimburse the cost of the drug for the treatment of addiction.

“(xiii) Such additional statistical data and information as the Director considers appropriate to demonstrate and assess trends relating to illicit drug use, the effects and consequences of illicit drug use, supply reduction, demand reduction, drug-related law enforcement, and the implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(xiv) A supplement reviewing the activities of each individual National Drug Control Program agency during the previous year with respect to the National Drug Control Strategy and the Director’s assessment of the progress of each National Drug Control Program agency in meeting its responsibilities under the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(B) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Any contents of the National Drug Control Strategy that involve information properly classified under criteria established by an Executive order shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(C) SELECTION OF DATA AND INFORMATION.—In selecting data and information for inclusion under subparagraph (A), the Director shall ensure—

“(i) the inclusion of data and information that will permit analysis of current trends against previously compiled data and information where the Director believes such analysis enhances long-term assessment of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

“(ii) the inclusion of data and information to permit a standardized and uniform assessment of the effectiveness of drug treatment programs in the United States.

“(3) PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION.—

“(A) CONSULTATION.—In developing and effectively implementing the National Drug Control Strategy, the Director—

“(i) shall consult with—

“(I) the heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies;

“(II) Congress;

“(III) State and local officials;

“(IV) private citizens and organizations, including community- and faith-based organizations, with experience and expertise in demand reduction;

“(V) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in supply reduction;

“(VI) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in law enforcement; and

“(VII) appropriate representatives of foreign governments;

“(ii) with the concurrence of the Attorney General, may require the El Paso Intelligence Center to undertake specific tasks or projects to implement the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(iii) with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General, may request that the National Drug Intelligence Center undertake specific tasks or projects to implement the National Drug Control Strategy; and

“(iv) may make recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services on research that supports or advances the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(B) COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT STRATEGY.—In satisfying the requirements of subparagraph (A)(i), the Director shall ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that State and local officials and relevant private organizations commit to support and take steps to achieve the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(C) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Recommendations under subparagraph (A)(iv) may include recommendations of research to be performed at the National Institutes of Health, including the National Institute on Drug Abuse, or any other appropriate agency within the Department of Health and Human Services.

“(D) INCLUSION IN STRATEGY.—The National Drug Control Strategy under this subsection

shall include a list of each entity consulted under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(4) SUBMISSION OF REVISED STRATEGY.—The President may submit to Congress a revised National Drug Control Strategy that meets the requirements of this section—

“(A) at any time, upon a determination by the President, in consultation with the Director, that the National Drug Control Strategy in effect is not sufficiently effective; or

“(B) if a new President or Director takes office.

“(b) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to Congress, as part of the National Drug Control Strategy, a description of a national drug control performance measurement system that—

“(1) develops 2-year and 5-year performance measures and targets for each National Drug Control Strategy goal and objective established for reducing drug use, drug availability, and the consequences of drug use;

“(2) describes the sources of information and data that will be used for each performance measure incorporated into the performance measurement system;

“(3) identifies major programs and activities of the National Drug Control Program agencies that support the goals and annual objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(4) evaluates the contribution of demand reduction and supply reduction activities implemented by each National Drug Control Program agency in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(5) monitors consistency of drug-related goals and objectives among the National Drug Control Program agencies and ensures that each agency's goals, objectives, and budgets support and are fully consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy; and

“(6) coordinates the development and implementation of national drug control data collection and reporting systems to support policy formulation and performance measurement, including an assessment of—

“(A) the quality of current drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure supply reduction and demand reduction activities;

“(B) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure the illicit drug user population, and groups that are at risk for illicit drug use; and

“(C) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national treatment outcome monitoring systems to measure the effectiveness of drug abuse treatment in reducing illicit drug use and criminal behavior during and after the completion of substance abuse treatment; and

“(7) identifies the actions the Director shall take to correct any inadequacies, deficiencies, or limitations identified in the assessment described in paragraph (6).

“(c) MODIFICATIONS.—A description of any modifications made during the preceding year to the national drug performance measurement system described in subsection (b) shall be included in each report submitted under subsection (a).”

SEC. 9. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.

Section 707 (21 U.S.C. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 707. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Office a program to be known as the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program (in this section referred to as the ‘Program’).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Program is to reduce drug trafficking and drug production in the United States by—

“(A) facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to

share information and implement coordinated enforcement activities;

“(B) enhancing intelligence sharing among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

“(C) providing reliable intelligence to law enforcement agencies needed to design effective enforcement strategies and operations; and

“(D) supporting coordinated law enforcement strategies which maximize use of available resources to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in designated areas and in the United States as a whole.

“(b) DESIGNATION.—The Director, upon consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies, and the Governor of each applicable State, may designate any specified area of the United States as a high intensity drug trafficking area. After making such a designation and in order to provide Federal assistance to the area so designated, the Director may—

“(1) obligate such sums as are appropriated for the Program;

“(2) direct the temporary reassignment of Federal personnel to such area, subject to the approval of the head of the department or agency that employs such personnel;

“(3) take any other action authorized under section 704 to provide increased Federal assistance to those areas; and

“(4) coordinate activities under this section (specifically administrative, recordkeeping, and funds management activities) with State and local officials.

“(c) PETITIONS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Director shall establish regulations under which a coalition of interested law enforcement agencies from an area may petition for designation as a high intensity drug trafficking area. Such regulations shall provide for a regular review by the Director of the petition, including a recommendation regarding the merit of the petition to the Director by a panel of qualified, independent experts.

“(d) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In considering whether to designate an area under this section as a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall consider, in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate, the extent to which—

“(1) the area is a significant center of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution;

“(2) State and local law enforcement agencies have committed resources to respond to the drug trafficking problem in the area, thereby indicating a determination to respond aggressively to the problem;

“(3) drug-related activities in the area are having a significant harmful impact in the area, and in other areas of the country; and

“(4) a significant increase in allocation of Federal resources is necessary to respond adequately to drug-related activities in the area.

“(e) ORGANIZATION OF HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—

“(1) EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS.—To be eligible for funds appropriated under this section, each high intensity drug trafficking area shall be governed by an Executive Board. The Executive Board shall designate a chairman, vice chairman, and any other officers to the Executive Board that it determines are necessary.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Executive Board of a high intensity drug trafficking area shall be responsible for—

“(A) providing direction and oversight in establishing and achieving the goals of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(B) managing the funds of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(C) reviewing and approving all funding proposals consistent with the overall objective of the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

“(D) reviewing and approving all reports to the Director on the activities of the high intensity drug trafficking area.

“(3) BOARD REPRESENTATION.—None of the funds appropriated under this section may be expended for any high intensity drug trafficking area, or for a partnership or region of a high intensity drug trafficking area, if that area's, region's or partnership's Executive Board does not apportion an equal number of votes between representatives of participating Federal agencies and representatives of participating State and local agencies. Where it is impractical for a equal number of representatives of Federal agencies and State and local agencies to attend a meeting of an Executive Board in person, the Executive Board may use a system of proxy votes or weighted votes to achieve the voting balance required by this paragraph.

“(4) NO AGENCY RELATIONSHIP.—The eligibility requirements of this section are intended to ensure the responsible use of Federal funds. Nothing in this section is intended to create an agency relationship between individual high intensity drug trafficking areas and the Federal Government.

“(f) USE OF FUNDS.—The Director shall ensure that no Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for the establishment or expansion of drug treatment programs, and shall ensure that not more than five percent of the Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for the establishment of drug prevention programs.

“(g) COUNTERTERRORISM ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Director may authorize use of resources available for the Program to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in investigations and activities related to terrorism and prevention of terrorism, especially but not exclusively with respect to such investigations and activities that are also related to drug trafficking.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Director shall ensure—

“(A) that assistance provided under paragraph (1) remains incidental to the purpose of the Program to reduce drug availability and carry out drug-related law enforcement activities; and

“(B) that significant resources of the Program are not redirected to activities exclusively related to terrorism, except on a temporary basis under extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Director.

“(h) ROLE OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that a representative of the Drug Enforcement Administration is included in the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area.

“(i) ANNUAL HIDTA PROGRAM BUDGET SUBMISSIONS.—As part of the documentation that supports the President's annual budget request for the Office, the Director shall submit to Congress a budget justification that includes the following:

“(1) The amount requested for each high intensity drug trafficking area with supporting narrative descriptions and rationale for each request.

“(2) A detailed justification for each funding request that explains the reasons for the requested funding level, how such funding level was determined based on a current assessment of the drug trafficking threat in each high intensity drug trafficking area, how such funding will ensure that the goals and objectives of each such area will be achieved, and how such funding supports the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(j) EMERGING THREAT RESPONSE FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may expend up to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section on a discretionary basis, to respond to any emerging drug trafficking threat in an existing high intensity drug trafficking area, or to establish a new high intensity drug trafficking area or expand an existing high intensity drug trafficking area, in accordance with the criteria established under paragraph (2).

“(2) **CONSIDERATION OF IMPACT.**—In allocating funds under this subsection, the Director shall consider—

“(A) the impact of activities funded on reducing overall drug traffic in the United States, or minimizing the probability that an emerging drug trafficking threat will spread to other areas of the United States; and

“(B) such other criteria as the Director considers appropriate.

“(k) **EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall, after consulting with the Executive Boards of each designated high intensity drug trafficking area, submit a report to Congress that describes, for each designated high intensity drug trafficking area—

“(A) the specific purposes for the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(B) the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives for the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(C) the measurements that will be used to evaluate the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in achieving the long-term and short-term goals; and

“(D) the reporting requirements needed to evaluate the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in achieving the long-term and short-term goals.

“(2) **EVALUATION OF HIDTA PROGRAM AS PART OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.**—For each designated high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall submit, as part of the annual National Drug Control Strategy report, a report that—

“(A) describes—

“(i) the specific purposes for the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

“(ii) the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives for the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

“(B) includes an evaluation of the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in accomplishing the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives identified under paragraph (1)(B).

“(l) **ASSESSMENT OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCES IN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and as part of each subsequent annual National Drug Control Strategy report, the Director shall submit to Congress a report—

“(1) assessing the number and operation of all federally funded drug enforcement task forces within each high intensity drug trafficking area; and

“(2) describing—

“(A) each Federal, State, and local drug enforcement task force operating in the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(B) how such task forces coordinate with each other, with any high intensity drug trafficking area task force, and with investigations receiving funds from the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force;

“(C) what steps, if any, each such task force takes to share information regarding drug trafficking and drug production with other federally funded drug enforcement task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(D) the role of the high intensity drug trafficking area in coordinating the sharing of such information among task forces;

“(E) the nature and extent of cooperation by each Federal, State, and local participant in ensuring that such information is shared among law enforcement agencies and with the high intensity drug trafficking area;

“(F) the nature and extent to which information sharing and enforcement activities are coordinated with joint terrorism task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

“(G) any recommendations for measures needed to ensure that task force resources are utilized efficiently and effectively to reduce the

availability of illegal drugs in the high intensity drug trafficking areas.

“(m) **ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE SHARING IN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS—PROGRAM.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and as part of each subsequent annual National Drug Control Strategy report, the Director shall submit to Congress a report—

“(1) evaluating existing and planned intelligence systems supported by each high intensity drug trafficking area, or utilized by task forces receiving any funding under the Program, including the extent to which such systems ensure access and availability of intelligence to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies within the high intensity drug trafficking area and outside of it;

“(2) the extent to which Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies participating in each high intensity drug trafficking area are sharing intelligence information to assess current drug trafficking threats and design appropriate enforcement strategies; and

“(3) the measures needed to improve effective sharing of information and intelligence regarding drug trafficking and drug production among Federal, State, and local law enforcement participating in a high intensity drug trafficking area, and between such agencies and similar agencies outside the high intensity drug trafficking area.

“(n) **COORDINATION OF INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE PROGRAM.**—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that any drug enforcement intelligence obtained by the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area is shared, on a timely basis, with the drug intelligence fusion center operated by the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force of the Department of Justice.

“(o) **USE OF FUNDS TO COMBAT METHAMPHETAMINE TRAFFICKING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year for the Program, at least \$15,000,000 is allocated to combat the trafficking of methamphetamine in areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas.

“(B) **ACTIVITIES.**—In meeting the requirement in subparagraph (A), the Director shall transfer funds to appropriate Federal, State, and local governmental agencies for employing additional Federal law enforcement personnel, or facilitating the employment of additional State and local law enforcement personnel, including agents, investigators, prosecutors, laboratory technicians, chemists, investigative assistants, and drug prevention specialists.

“(2) **APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.**—

“(A) **FACTORS IN APPORTIONMENT.**—The Director shall apportion amounts allocated under paragraph (1) among areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas based on the following factors:

“(i) The number of methamphetamine manufacturing facilities discovered by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

“(ii) The number of methamphetamine prosecutions in Federal, State, or local courts in the area during the previous fiscal year.

“(iii) The number of methamphetamine arrests by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

“(iv) The amounts of methamphetamine or listed chemicals (as that term is defined in section 102(33) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(33)) seized by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

“(v) Intelligence and predictive data from the Drug Enforcement Administration showing patterns and trends in abuse, trafficking, and transportation in methamphetamine and listed chemicals (as that term is so defined).

“(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—Before the Director apportions any funds under this paragraph to a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall certify that the law enforcement entities responsible for clandestine methamphetamine laboratory seizures in that area are providing laboratory seizure data to the national clandestine laboratory database at the El Paso Intelligence Center.

“(p) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to carry out this section—

“(1) \$280,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

“(2) \$290,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009; and

“(3) \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 and 2011.”

SEC. 10. FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Dawson Family Community Protection Act”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) In the early morning hours of October 16, 2002, the home of Carnell and Angela Dawson was firebombed in apparent retaliation for Mrs. Dawson’s notification of police about persistent drug distribution activity in their East Baltimore City neighborhood.

(2) The arson claimed the lives of Mr. and Mrs. Dawson and their 5 young children, aged 9 to 14.

(3) The horrific murder of the Dawson family is a stark example of domestic narco-terrorism.

(4) In all phases of counter-narcotics law enforcement—from prevention to investigation to prosecution to reentry—the voluntary cooperation of ordinary citizens is a critical component.

(5) Voluntary cooperation is difficult for law enforcement officials to obtain when citizens feel that cooperation carries the risk of violent retaliation by illegal drug trafficking organizations and their affiliates.

(6) Public confidence that law enforcement is doing all it can to make communities safe is a prerequisite for voluntary cooperation among people who may be subject to intimidation or reprisal (or both).

(7) Witness protection programs are insufficient on their own to provide security because many individuals and families who strive every day to make distressed neighborhoods livable for their children, other relatives, and neighbors will resist or refuse offers of relocation by local, State, and Federal prosecutorial agencies and because, moreover, the continued presence of strong individuals and families is critical to preserving and strengthening the social fabric in such communities.

(8) Where (as in certain sections of Baltimore City) interstate trafficking of illegal drugs has severe ancillary local consequences within areas designated as high intensity drug trafficking areas, it is important that supplementary High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program funds be committed to support initiatives aimed at making the affected communities safe for the residents of those communities and encouraging their cooperation with local, State, and Federal law enforcement efforts to combat illegal drug trafficking.

(c) **FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.**—Section 707 (21 U.S.C. 1706), as amended by section 9, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **SPECIFIC PURPOSES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year for the Program, at least \$7,000,000 is used in high intensity drug trafficking areas with severe neighborhood safety and illegal drug distribution problems.

“(2) **REQUIRED USES.**—The funds used under paragraph (1) shall be used—

“(A) to ensure the safety of neighborhoods and the protection of communities, including

the prevention of the intimidation of potential witnesses of illegal drug distribution and related activities; and

“(B) to combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.”.

SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COUNTER-DRUG TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT CENTER.

(a) **CHIEF SCIENTIST.**—Section 708(b) (21 U.S.C. 1707(b)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking “DIRECTOR OF TECHNOLOGY.” and inserting “CHIEF SCIENTIST.”; and

(2) by striking “Director of Technology,” and inserting “Chief Scientist.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.**—Section 708(c) (21 U.S.C. 1707(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, acting through the Chief Scientist shall—

“(A) identify and define the short-, medium-, and long-term scientific and technological needs of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies relating to drug enforcement, including—

“(i) advanced surveillance, tracking, and radar imaging;

“(ii) electronic support measures;

“(iii) communications;

“(iv) data fusion, advanced computer systems, and artificial intelligence; and

“(v) chemical, biological, radiological (including neutron, electron, and graviton), and other means of detection;

“(B) identify demand reduction (including drug prevention) basic and applied research needs and initiatives, in consultation with affected National Drug Control Program agencies, including—

“(i) improving treatment through neuroscientific advances;

“(ii) improving the transfer of biomedical research to the clinical setting; and

“(iii) in consultation with the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and through interagency agreements or grants, examining addiction and rehabilitation research and the application of technology to expanding the effectiveness or availability of drug treatment;

“(C) make a priority ranking of such needs identified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) according to fiscal and technological feasibility, as part of a National Counterdrug Research and Development Program;

“(D) oversee and coordinate counterdrug technology initiatives with related activities of other Federal civilian and military departments;

“(E) provide support to the development and implementation of the national drug control performance measurement system established under subsection (b) of section 706;

“(F) with the advice and counsel of experts from State and local law enforcement agencies, oversee and coordinate a technology transfer program for the transfer of technology to State and local law enforcement agencies; and

“(G) pursuant to the authority of the Director of National Drug Control Policy under section 704, submit requests to Congress for the reprogramming or transfer of funds appropriated for counterdrug technology research and development.

(2) **PRIORITIES IN TRANSFERRING TECHNOLOGY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technology under paragraph (1)(F), based on the following criteria:

“(i) the need of potential recipients for such technology;

“(ii) the effectiveness of the technology to enhance current counterdrug activities of potential recipients; and

“(iii) the ability and willingness of potential recipients to evaluate transferred technology.

“(B) **INTERDICTION AND BORDER DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGIES.**—The Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technologies most likely to assist in drug interdiction and border drug law enforcement, to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in southwest border areas and northern border areas with significant traffic in illicit drugs.

“(3) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.**—The authority granted to the Director under this subsection shall not extend to the direct management of individual projects or other operational activities.

“(4) **REPORT.**—On or before July 1 of each year, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that addresses the following:

“(A) The number of requests received during the previous 12 months, including the identity of each requesting agency and the type of technology requested.

“(B) The number of requests fulfilled during the previous 12 months, including the identity of each recipient agency and the type of technology transferred.

“(C) A summary of the criteria used in making the determination on what requests were funded and what requests were not funded, except that such summary shall not include specific information on any individual requests.

“(D) A general assessment of the future needs of the program, based on expected changes in threats, expected technologies, and likely need from potential recipients.

“(E) An assessment of the effectiveness of the technologies transferred, based in part on the evaluations provided by the recipients, with a recommendation whether the technology should continue to be offered through the program.”.

(c) **ASSISTANCE FROM SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—Section 708(d) (21 U.S.C. 1707(d)) is amended by inserting “, the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “The Secretary of Defense”.

SEC. 12. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 709 (21 U.S.C. 1708) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 709. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall conduct a national youth anti-drug media campaign (referred to in this subtitle as the “national media campaign”) in accordance with this section for the purposes of—

“(1) preventing drug abuse among young people in the United States;

“(2) increasing awareness of adults of the impact of drug abuse on young people; and

“(3) encouraging parents and other interested adults to discuss with young people the dangers of illegal drug use.

“(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts made available to carry out this section for the national media campaign may only be used for the following:

“(A) The purchase of media time and space, including the strategic planning for, and accounting of, such purchases.

“(B) Creative and talent costs, consistent with paragraph (2)(A).

“(C) Advertising production costs.

“(D) Testing and evaluation of advertising.

“(E) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the national media campaign.

“(F) The negotiated fees for the winning bidder on requests for proposals issued either by the Office or its designee to enter into contracts to carry out activities authorized by this section.

“(G) Partnerships with professional and civic groups, community-based organizations, including faith-based organizations, and government organizations related to the national media campaign.

“(H) Entertainment industry outreach, interactive outreach, media projects and activities, public information, news media outreach, and corporate sponsorship and participation.

“(I) Operational and management expenses.

“(2) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **CREATIVE SERVICES.**—

“(i) In using amounts for creative and talent costs under paragraph (1)(B), the Director shall use creative services donated at no cost to the Government (including creative services provided by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America) wherever feasible and may only procure creative services for advertising—

“(I) responding to high-priority or emergent campaign needs that cannot timely be obtained at no cost; or

“(II) intended to reach a minority, ethnic, or other special audience that cannot reasonably be obtained at no cost; or

“(III) the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide, pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(B).

“(ii) No more than \$1,500,000 may be expended under this section each fiscal year on creative services, except that the Director may expend up to \$2,000,000 in a fiscal year on creative services to meet urgent needs of the national media campaign with advance approval from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate upon a showing of the circumstances causing such urgent needs of the national media campaign.

“(B) **TESTING AND EVALUATION OF ADVERTISING.**—In using amounts for testing and evaluation of advertising under paragraph (1)(D), the Director shall test all advertisements prior to use in the national media campaign to ensure that the advertisements are effective and meet industry-accepted standards. The Director may waive this requirement for advertisements using no more than 10 percent of the purchase of advertising time purchased under this section in a fiscal year and no more than 10 percent of the advertising space purchased under this section in a fiscal year, if the advertisements respond to emergent and time-sensitive campaign needs or the advertisements will not be widely utilized in the national media campaign.

“(C) **EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDIA CAMPAIGN.**—In using amounts for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the national media campaign under paragraph (1)(E), the Director shall—

“(i) designate an independent entity to evaluate annually the effectiveness of the national media campaign based on data from—

“(I) the Monitoring the Future Study published by the Department of Health and Human Services;

“(II) the Attitude Tracking Study published by the Partnership for a Drug Free America;

“(III) the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse; and

“(IV) other relevant studies or publications, as determined by the Director, including tracking and evaluation data collected according to marketing and advertising industry standards; and

“(ii) ensure that the effectiveness of the national media campaign is evaluated in a manner that enables consideration of whether the national media campaign has contributed to reduction of illicit drug use among youth and such other measures of evaluation as the Director determines are appropriate.

“(3) **PURCHASE OF ADVERTISING TIME AND SPACE.**—For each fiscal year, not less than 77 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section shall be used for the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign, subject to the following exceptions:

“(A) In any fiscal year for which less than \$125,000,000 is appropriated for the national media campaign, not less than 82 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section shall be used for the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign.

“(B) In any fiscal year for which more than \$195,000,000 is appropriated under this section, not less than 72 percent shall be used for advertising production costs and the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign.

“(c) ADVERTISING.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that sufficient funds are allocated to meet the stated goals of the national media campaign.

“(d) DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS UNDER THE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, shall determine the overall purposes and strategy of the national media campaign.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(A) DIRECTOR.—The Director shall be responsible for implementing a focused national media campaign to meet the purposes set forth in subsection (a), and shall approve—

“(i) the strategy of the national media campaign;

“(ii) all advertising and promotional material used in the national media campaign; and

“(iii) the plan for the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign.

“(B) THE PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA.—The Director shall request that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America—

“(i) develop and recommend strategies to achieve the goals of the national media campaign, including addressing national and local drug threats in specific regions or States, such as methamphetamine and ecstasy;

“(ii) create all advertising to be used in the national media campaign, except advertisements that are—

“(I) provided by other nonprofit entities pursuant to subsection (f);

“(II) intended to respond to high-priority or emergent campaign needs that cannot timely be obtained at no cost (not including production costs and talent reuse payments), provided that any such advertising material is reviewed by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America;

“(III) intended to reach a minority, ethnic, or other special audience that cannot be obtained at no cost (not including production costs and talent reuse payments), provided that any such advertising material is reviewed by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America; or

“(IV) any other advertisements that the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide.

“(C) MEDIA BUYING CONTRACTOR.—The Director shall enter into a contract with a media buying contractor to plan and purchase advertising time and space for the national media campaign. The media buying contractor shall not provide any other service or material, or conduct any other function or activity which the Director determines should be provided by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America.

“(e) PROHIBITIONS.—None of the amounts made available under subsection (b) may be obligated or expended for any of the following:

“(1) To supplant current antidrug community-based coalitions.

“(2) To supplant pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks for other public service campaigns.

“(3) For partisan political purposes, or express advocacy in support of or to defeat any clearly identified candidate, clearly identified ballot initiative, or clearly identified legislative or regulatory proposal.

“(4) To fund advertising that features any elected officials, persons seeking elected office, cabinet level officials, or other Federal officials employed pursuant to section 213 of Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(5) To fund advertising that does not contain a primary message intended to reduce or prevent illicit drug use.

“(6) To fund advertising containing a primary message intended to promote support for the

media campaign or private sector contributions to the media campaign.

“(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available under subsection (b) for media time and space shall be matched by an equal amount of non-Federal funds for the national media campaign, or be matched with in-kind contributions of the same value.

“(2) NO-COST MATCH ADVERTISING DIRECT RELATIONSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall ensure that at least 70 percent of no-cost match advertising provided directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the national media campaign, except that in any fiscal year in which less than \$125,000,000 is appropriated to the national media campaign, the Director shall ensure that at least 85 percent of no-cost match advertising directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the national media campaign.

“(3) NO-COST MATCH ADVERTISING NOT DIRECTLY RELATED.—The Director shall ensure that no-cost match advertising that does not directly relate to substance abuse prevention consistent with the purposes of the national media campaign includes a clear antidrug message. Such message is not required to be the primary message of the match advertising.

“(g) FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Director shall cause to be performed—

“(1) audits and reviews of costs of the national media campaign pursuant to section 304C of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254d); and

“(2) an audit to determine whether the costs of the national media campaign are allowable under section 306 of such Act (41 U.S.C. 256).

“(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall submit on an annual basis a report to Congress that describes—

“(1) the strategy of the national media campaign and whether specific objectives of the media campaign were accomplished;

“(2) steps taken to ensure that the national media campaign operates in an effective and efficient manner consistent with the overall strategy and focus of the national media campaign;

“(3) plans to purchase advertising time and space;

“(4) policies and practices implemented to ensure that Federal funds are used responsibly to purchase advertising time and space and eliminate the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse; and

“(5) all contracts entered into with a corporation, partnership, or individual working on behalf of the national media campaign.

“(i) LOCAL TARGET REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, use amounts made available under this section for media that focuses on, or includes specific information on, prevention or treatment resources for consumers within specific local areas.

“(j) PREVENTION OF MARIJUANA USE.—

“(1) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

“(A) 60 percent of adolescent admissions for drug treatment are based on marijuana use.

“(B) Potency levels of contemporary marijuana, particularly hydroponically grown marijuana, are significantly higher than in the past, rising from under 1 percent of THC in the mid-1970s to as high as 30 percent today.

“(C) Contemporary research has demonstrated that youths smoking marijuana early in life may be up to five times more likely to use hard drugs.

“(D) Contemporary research has demonstrated clear detrimental effects in adolescent educational achievement resulting from marijuana use.

“(E) Contemporary research has demonstrated clear detrimental effects in adolescent brain development resulting from marijuana use.

“(F) An estimated 9,000,000 Americans a year drive while under the influence of illegal drugs, including marijuana.

“(G) Marijuana smoke contains 50 to 70 percent more of certain cancer causing chemicals than tobacco smoke.

“(H) Teens who use marijuana are up to four times more likely to have a teen pregnancy than teens who have not.

“(I) Federal law enforcement agencies have identified clear links suggesting that trade in hydroponic marijuana facilitates trade by criminal organizations in hard drugs, including heroin.

“(J) Federal law enforcement agencies have identified possible links between trade in cannabis products and financing for terrorist organizations.

“(2) EMPHASIS ON PREVENTION OF YOUTH MARIJUANA USE.—In conducting advertising and activities otherwise authorized under this section, the Director may emphasize prevention of youth marijuana use.

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this section, \$195,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and \$210,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011.”

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISIONS.—The Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 13. DRUG INTERDICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 711 (21 U.S.C. 1710) are amended to read as follows:

“(a) UNITED STATES INTERDICTION COORDINATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Director for Supply Reduction in the Office shall serve as the United States Interdiction Coordinator, and shall perform the duties of that position described in paragraph (2) and such other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to coordination of efforts to interdict illicit drugs from entering the United States.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The United States Interdiction Coordinator shall be responsible to the Director for—

“(A) coordinating the interdiction activities of the National Drug Control Program agencies to ensure consistency with the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(B) on behalf of the Director, developing and issuing, on or before March 1 of each year and in accordance with paragraph (3), a National Interdiction Command and Control Plan to ensure the coordination and consistency described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) assessing the sufficiency of assets committed to illicit drug interdiction by the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies; and

“(D) advising the Director on the efforts of each National Drug Control Program agency to implement the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan.

“(3) STAFF.—The Director shall assign such permanent staff of the Office as he considers appropriate to assist the United States Interdiction Coordinator to carry out the responsibilities described in paragraph (2), and may also, at his discretion, request that appropriate National Drug Control Program agencies detail or assign staff to the Office of Supply Reduction for that purpose.

“(4) NATIONAL INTERDICTION COMMAND AND CONTROL PLAN.—

“(A) PURPOSES.—The National Interdiction Command and Control Plan shall—

“(i) set forth the Government's strategy for drug interdiction;

“(ii) state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies for implementing that strategy; and

“(iii) identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies to implement that strategy.

“(B) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The United States Interdiction Coordinator

shall issue the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan in consultation with the other members of the Interdiction Committee described in subsection (b).

“(C) **LIMITATION.**—The National Interdiction Command and Control Plan shall not change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws.

“(D) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—On or before March 1 of each year, the United States Interdiction Coordinator shall provide a report on behalf of the Director to the appropriate congressional committees, to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, which shall include—

“(i) a copy of that year’s National Interdiction Command and Control Plan;

“(ii) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number and type of seizures of drugs by each National Drug Control Program agency conducting drug interdiction activities, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures; and

“(iii) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number of air and maritime patrol hours undertaken by each National Drug Control Program agency conducting drug interdiction activities, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas in which such patrol hours took place.

“(E) **TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.**—Any content of the report described in subparagraph (D) that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or the public disclosure of which, as determined by the United States Interdiction Coordinator or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the plan.

“(b) **INTERDICTION COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Interdiction Committee shall meet to—

“(A) discuss and resolve issues related to the coordination, oversight and integration of international, border, and domestic drug interdiction efforts in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(B) review the annual National Interdiction Command and Control Plan, and provide advice to the Director and the United States Interdiction Coordinator concerning that plan; and

“(C) provide such other advice to the Director concerning drug interdiction strategy and policies as the committee determines is appropriate.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of the Interdiction Committee shall consist of—

“(A) the Commissioner of the bureau of Customs and Border Protection at the Department of Homeland Security;

“(B) the Assistant Secretary of the bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security;

“(C) the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard;

“(D) the Director of the Office of Counter-narcotics Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security;

“(E) the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration;

“(F) the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs;

“(G) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict;

“(H) the Deputy Director for Supply Reduction of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, acting in his role as the United States Interdiction Coordinator;

“(I) the director of the Crime and Narcotics Center of the Central Intelligence Agency;

“(J) the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs of the Office of National Drug Control Policy;

“(K) the Chief of the National Guard Bureau’s Counterdrug Program; and

“(L) such additional persons as may be determined by the Director.

“(3) **CHAIRMAN.**—The Director shall designate one of the members of the Interdiction Committee to serve as chairman.

“(4) **MEETINGS.**—The members of the Interdiction Committee shall meet, in person and not through any delegate or representative, at least once per calendar year, prior to March 1. At the call of either the Director or the current chairman, the Interdiction Committee may hold additional meetings, which shall be attended by the members either in person, or through such delegates or representatives as they may choose.

“(5) **REPORT.**—Not later than September 30 of each year, the chairman of the Interdiction Committee shall submit a report to the Director and to the appropriate congressional committees describing the results of the meetings and any significant findings of the Committee during the previous 12 months. Any content of such a report that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director, the chairman, or any member, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the report.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.**—Section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 458) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “Except as provided in subsection (d), the” and inserting “The”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

SEC. 14. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO SHUT DOWN ILLICIT DRUG MARKET HOT-SPOTS BY DETERRING DRUG DEALERS OR ALTERING THE DYNAMIC OF DRUG SALES.

Sections 713 and 714 (21 U.S.C. 1711) are redesignated as sections 715 and 716, respectively, and after section 712 (21 U.S.C. 1710) insert the following new section:

“SEC. 713 AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO SHUT DOWN ILLICIT DRUG MARKET HOT-SPOTS BY DETERRING DRUG DEALERS OR ALTERING THE DYNAMIC OF DRUG SALES.

“(a) **AWARDS REQUIRED.**—The Director shall make competitive awards for demonstration programs by eligible partnerships for the purpose of shutting down local illicit drug market hot-spots and reducing drug-related crime through evidence-based, strategic problem-solving interventions that deter drug dealers or alter the dynamic of drug sales.

“(b) **USE OF AWARD AMOUNTS.**—Award amounts received under this section shall be used—

“(1) to support the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and researchers included in the eligible partnership;

“(2) to develop and field a directed and credible deterrent threat; and

“(3) to strengthen rehabilitation efforts through such means as job training, drug treatment, or other services.

“(c) **ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘eligible partnership’ means a working group whose application to the Director—

“(1) identifies the roles played, and certifies the involvement of, three or more agencies or organizations, which may include—

“(A) State or local agencies (such as those carrying out police, probation, prosecution,

courts, corrections, parole, or treatment functions);

“(B) Federal agencies (such as the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and United States Attorney offices); and

“(C) community-based organizations;

“(2) includes a qualified researcher;

“(3) includes a plan for identifying the impact players in, and assessing the nature and dynamic of, the local drug market and its related crime through information gathering and analysis;

“(4) includes a plan for developing an evidence-based strategic intervention aimed at quickly and sustainably eradicating the local drug market by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales; and

“(5) includes a plan that describes the methodology and outcome measures proposed for evaluating the impact of that strategic intervention on drug sales, neighborhood disorder, and crime.

“(d) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **INTERIM REPORT.**—Not later than June 1, 2009, the Director shall submit to Congress a report that identifies the best practices in drug market eradication, including the best practices identified through the activities funded under this section.

“(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than June 1, 2010, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration programs funded under this section, including on the matters specified in paragraph (1).

“(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009.”.

SEC. 15. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO COERCE ABSTINENCE IN CHRONIC HARD-DRUG USERS UNDER COMMUNITY SUPERVISION THROUGH THE USE OF DRUG TESTING AND SANCTIONS.

After section 713, as inserted by section 14 of this Act, insert the following new section:

“SEC. 714. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO COERCE ABSTINENCE IN CHRONIC HARD-DRUG USERS UNDER COMMUNITY SUPERVISION THROUGH THE USE OF DRUG TESTING AND SANCTIONS.

“(a) **AWARDS REQUIRED.**—The Director shall make competitive awards to fund demonstration programs by eligible partnerships for the purpose of reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users living in the community while under the supervision of the criminal justice system.

“(b) **USE OF AWARD AMOUNTS.**—Award amounts received under this section shall be used—

“(1) to support the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and researchers included in the eligible partnership;

“(2) to develop and field a drug testing and graduated sanctions program for chronic hard-drug users living in the community under criminal justice supervision; and

“(3) to assist individuals described in subsection (a) by strengthening rehabilitation efforts through such means as job training, drug treatment, or other services.

“(c) **ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘eligible partnership’ means a working group whose application to the Director—

“(1) identifies the roles played, and certifies the involvement of, two or more agencies or organizations, which may include—

“(A) State or local agencies (such as those carrying out police, probation, prosecution, courts, corrections, parole, or treatment functions);

“(B) Federal agencies (such as the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and United States Attorney offices); and

“(C) community-based organizations;

“(2) includes a qualified researcher;

“(3) includes a plan for using judicial or other criminal justice authority to administer drug tests to individuals described in subsection (a) at least twice a week, and to swiftly and certainly impose a known set of graduated sanctions for non-compliance with community-release provisions relating to drug abstinence (whether imposed as a pre-trial, probation, or parole condition or otherwise);

“(4) includes a strategy for responding to a range of substance use and abuse problems and a range of criminal histories;

“(5) includes a plan for integrating data infrastructure among the agencies and organizations included in the eligible partnership to enable seamless, real-time tracking of individuals described in subsection (a);

“(6) includes a plan to monitor and measure the progress toward reducing the percentage of the population of individuals described in subsection (a) who, upon being summoned for a drug test, either fail to show up or who test positive for drugs.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2009, the Director shall submit to Congress a report that identifies the best practices in reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users, including the best practices identified through the activities funded under this section.

“(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2010, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration programs funded under this section, including on the matters specified in paragraph (1).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009.”

SEC. 16. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 716 (21 U.S.C. 1711), as redesignated by section 14 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking “title,” and inserting “title, except activities for which amounts are otherwise specifically authorized by this title,”; and

(2) by striking “1999 through 2003” and inserting “2007 through 2011”.

SEC. 17. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND REPEAL.

(a) AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO REPLACE OBSOLETE REFERENCES.—Section 464P(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285o-4(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “under section 1002 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1501)” and inserting “under section 703 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1702)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “under section 1005 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1504)” and inserting “under section 706 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1705)”.

(b) REPEAL OF SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND.—Section 6073 of the Asset Forfeiture Amendments Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1509) is repealed.

SEC. 18. REQUIREMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL SPONSORSHIP OF ALL FEDERAL ADVERTISING OR OTHER COMMUNICATION MATERIALS.

Section 712 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 712. REQUIREMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL SPONSORSHIP OF ALL FEDERAL ADVERTISING OR OTHER COMMUNICATION MATERIALS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Each advertisement or other communication paid for by the Office, either directly or through a contract awarded by the Office, shall include a prominent notice informing the target audience that the advertisement or other communication is paid for by the Office.

“(b) ADVERTISEMENT OR OTHER COMMUNICATION.—In this section, the term ‘advertisement or other communication’ includes—

“(1) an advertisement disseminated in any form, including print or by any electronic means; and

“(2) a communication by an individual in any form, including speech, print, or by any electronic means.”

SEC. 19. POLICY RELATING TO SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.

Section 703(a) (21 U.S.C. 1702(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“When developing the national drug control policy, any policy of the Director relating to syringe exchange programs for intravenous drug users shall be based on the best available medical and scientific evidence regarding their effectiveness in promoting individual health and preventing the spread of infectious disease, and their impact on drug addiction and use. In making any policy relating to syringe exchange programs, the Director shall consult with the National Institutes of Health and the National Academy of Sciences.”

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those printed in House Report 109-387. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 145, strike lines 3 through 9.

Page 145, line 10, strike “(vi)” and insert “(v)”.

Page 145, line 15, strike “(vii)” and insert “(vi)”.

Page 146, line 5, strike “(viii)” and insert “(vii)”.

Page 148, line 19, strike “(g)” and insert “(h)”.

Page 149, line 7, strike “(h)” and insert “(i)”.

Page 149, strike lines 9 through 18 and insert the following:

(1) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

“(g) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—The provisions of this section shall not apply to the National Intelligence Program, the Joint Military Intelligence Program, and Tactical and Related Activities unless such program or an element of such program is designated as a National Drug Control Program—

“(1) by the President; or

“(2) jointly by—

“(A) in the case of the National Intelligence Program, the Director and the Director of National Intelligence; or

“(B) in the case of the Joint Military Intelligence Program and Tactical and Related Activities, the Director, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

“(h) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as derogating the authorities and responsibilities of the Director of National Intelligence or the Director of the

Central Intelligence Agency contained in the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.), or any other law.”

Page 149, line 19, strike “(i)” and insert “(j)”.

Page 151, line 14, strike “(j)” and insert “(k)”.

Page 153, line 3, strike “(k)” and insert “(l)”.

Page 158, line 7, strike “(l)” and insert “(m)”.

Page 160, line 14, strike “(m)” and insert “(n)”.

Page 183, line 18, strike “The” and insert the following: “Subject to the availability of appropriations, the”.

Page 187, line 22, insert after “Director” the following: “, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence.”.

Page 202, line 12, strike “No” and insert the following: “Subject to the availability of appropriations, no”.

Page 204, line 21, strike “For” and insert the following: “Subject to the availability of appropriations, for”.

Page 217, strike lines 14 through 19, and insert the following:

Director, the Director of National Intelligence, or the head of any Federal Government agency the activities of which are described in the plan, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the report.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment makes technical and conforming changes to account for changes in the law within the jurisdiction of those committees that waived formal business meetings on H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005.

On page 145, the manager's amendment strikes the mandatory restrictions on certification of budgets related to enforcement in certain contexts of section 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act, more popularly known as the Drug-Free Student Loan provision.

The provision made students convicted of drug offenses temporarily not eligible to receive student loans. However, a significant problem had arisen in the Department of Education, beginning during the Clinton administration and continuing during the current administration, because they have misinterpreted the clear language of that statute to improperly deny loans to students whose drug convictions predated their enrollment in school.

□ 1230

Section 8021 of the Deficit Reduction Act, Public Law 109-171, signed into law on February 8, 2006, contained language that altered the interpretation of a provision included in the Higher Education Act, and therefore obviated

the need to address this matter in H.R. 2829.

The manager's amendment changes made on pages 149, 187, and 217 and the related conforming amendments are based on technical recommendations made by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence through the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The technical amendments were thought desirable to make the ONDCP authorization reflect changes made by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, Public Law 108-458, and related authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Maryland opposed to the amendment?

Mr. CUMMINGS. No. As a matter of fact, I support the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland may control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. There are so many young people who find themselves getting into difficulty with drugs. The fact is when it predated their getting Federal funding for schooling, that is one thing; it is another thing when it happens during the time that they are getting the Federal funding. I would like to see it all eliminated, but the fact still remains that I think this is a good amendment. It is a step in the right direction. It is one that I have heard a lot of concern. Every time I do a town hall meeting on scholarships, this issue comes up. I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out again the effect of taking that language out means the bill is now silent on the drug loan provision. The other changes had to do with the Intelligence Committee and other committees that waived jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise to offer amendment number 2, designated to be offered by the gentleman from Washington or a designee?

Mr. SOUDER. I will introduce the Baird amendment. I am a cosponsor of the Baird amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I am acting as his designee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. INTERNATIONAL SUMMIT ON METHAMPHETAMINE THREAT.

(a) **SUMMIT REQUIREMENT.**—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy in the Executive Office of the President shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the United States Trade Representative, seek to convene an international summit on the threat of methamphetamine and synthetic drug precursor chemicals.

(b) **PARTICIPATION OF OTHER COUNTRIES.**—The Director shall seek to convene the summit with the participation and involvement of government leaders at the highest level from all countries that are direct sources of precursor chemicals and from all countries that are affected by methamphetamine production, trafficking, and use, to intensify and coordinate an effective international response in order to prevent methamphetamine production and precursor diversion.

(c) **INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—The Director shall encourage the negotiation, drafting, and ratification of multilateral or bilateral agreements that may contain information-sharing treaties concerning provisions for precursor importation and exportation and additional provisions for annual assessments of medical and scientific needs of each signatory country.

(d) **MATTERS ADDRESSED BY THE SUMMIT.**—The summit may address the following:

(1) The greater involvement of international policing and customs organizations, such as Interpol, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and the World Customs Organization.

(2) Expanding resources and hired persons to track international shipments of ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, and other precursor substances as controlled by the International Narcotics Control Board.

(3) Working with the private sector and Federal agencies, as well as the World Health Organization, to support the research and development of substances that can effectively replace primary precursors used in the manufacture of synthetic drugs.

(e) **DEADLINE.**—The Director shall seek to convene the summit not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and follow-up summits in subsequent years as the Director finds necessary.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to give my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington will control the time in support of the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER). I appreciate the courtesy and I appreciate very much his leadership on this legislation and on the broad issue of methamphetamine in general.

Our Nation is truly safer for the efforts of Mr. SOUDER, and it has been a pleasure to work with him on the amendment we offer today. I also want to compliment my good friend and colleague, Mr. CARDOZA of California, and Ms. HOOLEY from Oregon.

Recent articles, a series in the Oregonian and also a Frontline special, have articulated the challenges that we face in fighting methamphetamine due to international supply of the methamphetamine precursor, pseudoephedrine and ephedrine.

We have done good work just recently with the passage of the Combat Meth Act to curtail the supply coming directly into the United States, but transshipment of pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, and other precursors is a terrific problem that is really leading to the supply increases that we are seeing on our streets.

The good news on the meth front is that we are seeing a reduction of the local clandestine labs. The bad news is that the international trafficking has increased. Indeed, recent DEA reports show that the purity of methamphetamine on the streets has reached the 70 percent level. Now, we know from clinical and historical data that what happens in that case is an increase in the number of addictions, an increase in the number of drug-related crimes, of hospital admissions, et cetera.

For that reason, we are offering today's amendment, and what it does is quite simple. It asks the administration to conduct an international summit to work with the other methamphetamine precursor producing countries to try to reach international accords that would curtail the production and shipment of pseudoephedrine and ephedrine and other precursors that would ultimately be manufactured into methamphetamine. It is a commonsense amendment. I think this is a drug that we can actually defeat if we can choke off the air supply of the precursors.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Has anyone claimed the time in opposition?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this amendment and we are willing to accept this amendment. This amendment seeks to strengthen the bill by highlighting the problem of methamphetamine. I think it is very important that this House continue to go on record every day possible, every amendment possible.

Again, the gentleman from Washington has been the founder of the Meth Caucus and Congressman LARSEN, Congressman CANNON, and Congressman CALVERT in the Meth Caucus have been active in doing this. I think it is important to look at an international summit.

Clearly, as we dealt with the major methamphetamine bill that is part of the antiterrorism bill, we realize that as we get control of pseudoephedrine behind the counter, this becomes much more of an international problem. In Oklahoma, which was the first State, really, to enact tough legislation, they have seen crystal meth come in behind and become a scourge on their State. We see it in Oregon and Washington, other States around the country. As you crack down on the so-called "mom and pop labs" and the "Nazi labs" you move to crystal meth. That is better for local law enforcement but bad for the individuals because it is even more potent.

Crystal meth is coming from an international market. It started over in Asia. There are nine basic facilities in the world, the Czech Republic has closed theirs, but Germany as well as China and India. Much of it comes across our border from Mexico, and without cooperation on an international basis, without working with the U.N. antinarcotics efforts, we cannot tackle this in the United States.

We have attempted to put up walls in the Combat Meth Act. We had things for the spot market. We had new measuring things and so on, but ultimately that is just trying to put up a wall around the United States. We have to figure out how we are going to cooperatively work with India, China, and Mexico and other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I want to compliment Mr. BAIRD and the other cosponsors of this amendment. There is no doubt about it, Mr. SOUDER and I, over and over again we see, as the ranking members of our subcommittee, so many of our members coming to us and telling us about the problems with methamphetamines in their districts. We have traveled across the country and listened to the testimony of various members and police and law enforcement folks and people who are trying to address this problem. And it is, in fact, a growing problem.

While we have seen a lot of emphasis put on it, I think that this amendment goes very far to try to shine even more light on this tragic problem. And one of the things that we found so interesting about the whole methamphetamine situation, it is a little different than other drugs in that you have to have a clean-up. We spent a lot of money for clean-up. And we find many instances where children are tremendously affected because they have to be placed in foster care programs, because they have to be literally taken out of the house, the house usually has all kinds of problems, and they end up basically with no parents that are available to take care of them.

So it has been a tremendous strain on our law enforcement agencies, our foster care agencies. I see this as a step in the right direction, and I would trust that we would support this amendment. I want to thank Mr. SOUDER for yielding.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) who has been a champion of the meth issue and has been a leader in passing legislation that would help combat this drug.

Ms. HOOLEY. I thank my colleague for yielding me time and for all the hard work that has gone on with methamphetamine, and I rise today in support of the Baird-Cardoza-Hooley amendment.

As meth has spread across this Nation, more and more States are taking action to cut off pseudoephedrine sales to meth makers who cannot make the poison without this common cold medication. But when 65 percent of the meth in this country comes from Mexico drug cartels, we cannot solve this problem through domestic means alone.

This amendment requires that our drug office join with other affected countries to coordinate an effective international response in order to prevent methamphetamine production and precursor diversion.

In a revealing investigation, the Oregonian newspaper determined that Mexico imports roughly 100 tons of pseudoephedrine more than is needed to fill its need for cold medicine. The rest, narcotic officials guess, is diverted from legitimate uses and turned into meth. Since roughly 200 tons of pseudoephedrine is needed to produce all the meth sold in the United States, this pseudoephedrine from Mexico can produce half of our Nation's supply of this deadly drug.

This amendment will bring together international leaders so they can work together and collaborate on a broad-based strategy that will not only keep meth away from our communities and families but would limit production and use of this deadly drug worldwide. I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent remarks and for her leadership. In closing, I would like to reiterate my grati-

tude for Mr. SOUDER. He has been a champion of this issue. I also want to acknowledge, as he did, the Caucus to Control and Fight Methamphetamine, which is cochaired by my dear friend, RICK LARSEN from Washington State, along with LEN BOSWELL from Iowa, CHRIS CANNON, and KEN CALVERT.

It is truly a bipartisan, nationwide effort. And now what we need to do with this amendment is expand that effort internationally. If we can stop the international supply of these precursors, our communities will be safer, our families will be safer, and a lot of people whose lives would be ruined will never have to suffer that tragic fate.

I am grateful for the support of Mr. SOUDER for this amendment and I urge its passage.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment before us today calling for a global meth conference.

I commend Mr. Baird for working to bring this amendment to the floor. The amendment closely mirrors the bipartisan "Sense of the Congress" resolution I introduced in November calling for an international methamphetamine conference to develop a global strategy to control the trafficking of meth and its precursor chemicals.

I also would like to thank Chairman SOUDER of the Drug Policy Subcommittee for his support from the beginning of a global meth conference and his leadership on the Methamphetamine Epidemic Elimination Act which is set to be signed into law as part of the PATRIOT Act.

In my district in California's Central Valley, the meth epidemic has exacted a brutal toll on the environment, our children, and our communities. In the past 5 years alone, 15,000 children have been found at meth labs, not to mention the unknown number of children subjected to meth related domestic violence, abuse, and neglect.

Mr. Chairman, controlling the global trade in meth and its precursor chemicals, ephedrine and pseudoephedrine, is a critical part of any comprehensive strategy to fight the meth epidemic. A global meth conference is a logical next step that complements the international regulation provisions of the Meth Elimination Act.

It is about time that we develop a worldwide strategy to reduce illegal trade in meth and its precursor chemicals and stop the devastating impact that methamphetamine use is having on our children and our communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1245

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BOOZMAN

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. BOOZMAN:
Page 168, line 17, strike "and".

Page 168, line 19, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 168, after line 19, insert the following:
"(IV) the effect of illicit drug use on children of substance abusers."

Page 170, line 12, insert after "drug use" the following: "(including the effects on children of substance abusers)".

At the end of the bill add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. STUDY ON DRUG COURT HEARINGS IN NONTRADITIONAL PLACES.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that encouraging drug courts and schools to enter into partnerships that allow students to see the repercussions of drug abuse by non-violent offenders may serve as a strong deterrent and promote demand reduction.

(b) STUDY.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study on drug court programs that conduct hearings in nontraditional public places, such as schools. At a minimum, the study shall evaluate similar programs in operation, such as the program operated in the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court, in Washington County, Arkansas.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—At the same time the President submits to Congress the National Drug Control Strategy due February 1, 2007, pursuant to section 706 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (b). The report shall include an evaluation of the results of the study and such recommendations as the President considers appropriate.

(d) DEMAND REDUCTION.—In this section, the term "demand reduction" has the meaning provided in section 702(1) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701(1)).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate this opportunity to offer an amendment which will strengthen the hand of Congress in the future as we work to protect the most vulnerable children in our society and as we work to deter the abuse of drugs in our culture.

This amendment would provide for two simple actions by ONDCP. First, the amendment would require the director of ONDCP to include in the National Drug Control Strategy statistical data and information to demonstrate and assess trends relating to the effects of illicit drug use on children of substance abusers. This information will assist Congress, as well as States, local governments and private groups, as we work to protect these children.

As we all know, one of the greatest tragedies of drug abuse is the terrible effect these crimes have on the most vulnerable members of society, children. Children of substance abusers are the innocent victims of drug abuse, and

research shows that these children are much more likely to become drug abusers themselves when they reach adolescence or adulthood. Congress should do all it can to protect these innocent children, while we have the chance; and no effective National Drug Control Strategy would be complete without considering the effects on children of substance abusers and how we can help prevent the cycle of drug abuse.

We all know from experience that children who have grown up in homes in this sort of condition are much more likely to use drugs themselves. In Arkansas, State, local, and private groups are working hard to assist meth-endangered children, kids, who are some of the most vulnerable, of substance abusers. Several years ago, I visited with a high school young lady whose parent had recently committed suicide as a result of being high on meth. He was a truck driver. He had been on the drug for many, many years; and she was being a model student. There was really nothing, there was no agency, there was no help for her. So, again, I think this is very, very important and something that would be great if we could study and then use that information to go further.

The second part of this amendment requires the director of ONDCP to conduct a study on drug court programs that hold hearings in nontraditional public places, such as schools. As you all know, the mission of a drug court is to provide an alternative to incarceration for nonviolent persons convicted of alcohol or other drug-related charges. In order to reduce demand and deter our kids from getting involved in illegal drugs, we must make sure they understand the consequences of drug abuse. We spend a lot of time and money talking to kids about the repercussions of drug abuse, but this type of program allows us to show them the consequences.

In my congressional district, I have seen firsthand the strong impact that such a program has had on school-age kids. Judge Mary Ann Gunn of the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court in Washington County, Arkansas, has been taking her program into the schools for several years with the strong support of school administrators and the community. She uses the opportunity to visit with students about the drug problem, and it has had a profound effect on many kids. Experience has shown that her program is a strong deterrent for young people, and it strongly promotes demand reduction among our youth.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to reduce the harm experienced by children of substance abusers and to study drug court programs that could be a tremendous deterrent to young people nationwide. These two items may seem small, but they are critical steps in saving future generations from the harm caused by drug abuse.

I commend Chairman SOUDER for his work on this very important bill. I ap-

preciate the hard work that he and his staff and the other members of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, have put into this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the time in opposition to support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to thank the gentleman for this amendment. It is a very important amendment, and I have no doubt that it makes the bill a better bill.

One of the things we have seen in my district and all over the country is that there are these cycles of drug addiction; and I think one of the saddest things, and I saw this as a lawyer, too, when I practiced, is to represent a parent and then a few years later see a child come in. They both have been drug users. So the cycle of drug addiction keeps going around and around. So I think that is a very, very important piece to look at, how the children are affected.

As far as the nontraditional places with regard to drug courts is concerned, I think that is another good idea. I think what happens too often is that you have young people who will experiment or they get involved, but there are even a lot of times you do not think about consequences. They do not think about how they may have to very well come in contact with our judicial system. I think that this is an excellent way that we need to look at that, figure out ways by which we might do that; and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I also strongly support this amendment. I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas being one of the first Members to really push us to focus on methamphetamines. His district has been hard hit. Early on it was featured in People magazine. We did a congressional hearing in our subcommittee in his district where we heard from everyone, from drug court to people who were working directly with children and the impact on children.

At another hearing in Minnesota, at the request of a number of Members, we heard in Ramsey County, which is St. Paul, that they went from zero to 80 percent of the kids in child custody in the welfare department being addicts of meth. From nothing to 80 percent, in 6 months.

When methamphetamine hits your area, it takes over and overwhelms your juvenile systems, overwhelms the child custody system, and overwhelms the criminal system. I very much appreciate this amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:
(n) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT NATIONAL SYNTHETIC DRUGS ACTION STRATEGY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the National Synthetic Drugs Action Strategy outlined in the National Synthetic Drugs Action Plan submitted by the Director in October 2004.

(o) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY OF STATE PRECURSOR CHEMICAL CONTROL LAWS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study of State laws with respect to precursor chemical controls.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study under paragraph (1), including—

(A) a comparison of the State laws studied and the effectiveness of each such law; and

(B) a list of best practices observed with respect to such laws.

(p) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY OF DRUG ENDANGERED CHILDREN PROGRAMS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study of methamphetamine-related activities that are conducted by different Drug Endangered Children programs administered by States.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study under paragraph (1). Such report shall include—

(A) an analysis of the best practices of the activities studied; and

(B) recommendations for establishing a national policy to address drug endangered children, based on the Drug Endangered Children programs administered by States.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “methamphetamine-related activity” means any activity related to the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine; and

(B) the term “drug endangered children” means children whose physical, mental, or emotional health are at risk because of the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine by another person.

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. NATIONAL METHAMPHETAMINE INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse Act of 2005”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Council” means the National Methamphetamine Advisory Council established under subsection (c)(2)(A);

(2) the term “drug endangered children” means children whose physical, mental, or emotional health are at risk because of the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine by another person;

(3) the term “National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse” or “NMIC” means the information clearinghouse established under subsection (c)(1); and

(4) the term “qualified entity” means a State or local government, school board, or public health, law enforcement, nonprofit, or other nongovernmental organization providing services related to methamphetamine.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE AND ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) CLEARINGHOUSE.—There is established, under the supervision of the Director of National Drug Control Policy, an information clearinghouse to be known as the National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse.

(2) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established an advisory council to be known as the National Methamphetamine Advisory Council.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall consist of 10 members appointed by the Director of National Drug Control Policy—

(i) not fewer than three of whom shall be representatives of law enforcement agencies;

(ii) not fewer than four of whom shall be representatives of nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations providing services related to methamphetamine; and

(iii) one of whom shall be a representative of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(C) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for three years. Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) NMIC REQUIREMENTS AND REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The NMIC shall promote sharing information regarding successful law enforcement, treatment, environmental, social services, and other programs related to the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine and grants available for such programs.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The NMIC shall include—

(A) a toll-free number; and

(B) a website that—

(i) provides information on the short-term and long-term effects of methamphetamine use;

(ii) provides information regarding methamphetamine treatment programs and programs for drug endangered children, including descriptions of successful programs and contact information for such programs;

(iii) provides information regarding grants for methamphetamine-related programs, including contact information and links to websites;

(iv) allows a qualified entity to submit items to be posted on the website regarding successful public or private programs or other useful information related to the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine;

(v) includes a restricted section that may only be accessed by a law enforcement organization that contains successful strategies, training techniques, and other information that the Council determines helpful to law enforcement agency efforts to combat the production, use or effects of methamphetamine;

(vi) allows public access to all information not in a restricted section; and

(vii) contains any additional information the Council determines may be useful in

combating the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine.

(3) REVIEW OF POSTED INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of an item by a qualified entity, the Council shall review an item submitted for posting on the website described in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) to evaluate and determine whether the item, as submitted or as modified, meets the requirements for posting; and

(ii) in consultation with the Director of National Drug Control Policy, to determine whether the item should be posted in a restricted section of the website.

(B) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 45 days after the date of submission of an item, the Council shall—

(i) post the item on the website described in paragraph (2)(B); or

(ii) notify the qualified entity that submitted the item regarding the reason such item shall not be posted and modifications, if any, that the qualified entity may make to allow the item to be posted.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) for fiscal year 2007—

(i) \$1,000,000 to establish the NMIC and Council; and

(ii) such sums as are necessary for the operation of the NMIC and Council; and

(B) for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as are necessary for the operation of the NMIC and Council.

SEC. 21. REPORT ON SCHOOL DRUG TESTING.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on drug testing in schools. The report shall include a list of secondary schools that have initiated drug testing from among those schools that have attended conferences on drug testing sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 22. REPORT ON METHAMPHETAMINE EPIDEMIC.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on methamphetamine usage in the United States. The report shall describe the usage by zip code based on information obtained from industrial and school drug testing and seizures of clandestine laboratories.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 23. REPORT ON ONDCP PERFORMANCE BONUSES.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on performance bonuses at the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The report shall include a list of employees who received performance bonuses, and the amount of such bonuses, for the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on the date of submission of the report.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of a bipartisan amendment that I have drafted with several Members of the Meth Caucus to address the national methamphetamine epidemic our Nation faces. I have offered this amendment along with Representatives BOSWELL, CALVERT, CANNON and LARSEN of Washington; and I would like to thank all of these gentlemen for their leadership in not only drafting this amendment but in working very hard in this fight against drugs in our country.

Specifically, I wanted to highlight the provisions of the amendment that would create a National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse. Several communities in my State have expressed the need to obtain and share information related to methamphetamine abuse and addiction. The national database would promote sharing of best practices among the law enforcement, prevention, treatment, and social services communities.

The database will be governed by an advisory council comprised of members from a variety of agencies and organizations. This council will be responsible for monitoring these submissions to the clearinghouse and making sure that information found on the site is accurate, up to date and useful.

The methamphetamine problem has grown at a dramatic rate and is now considered the most significant drug abuse problem in the country, surpassing marijuana. The impact of this problem has hit local law enforcement and communities with dramatic, direct, and collateral consequences.

The National Association of Counties recently published a survey that shows that 60 percent of responding counties stated that methamphetamine was their largest drug problem, 60 percent of these. Sixty-seven percent reported increases in meth-related arrests.

I will continue to support measures such as these and the Meth Elimination Act that was included in the PATRIOT Act to crack down on meth users and give local law enforcement and the public at large tools to help fight this national epidemic.

I would like to thank all those sponsors, Mr. BOSWELL and others who have been very active in this effort, for being cosponsors and supporters of this particular legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the time in opposition to support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I fully support this amendment, and I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) who is a

member of the Meth Caucus and has been just a tremendous leader with regard to this issue and so many others, too.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me the time. I appreciate it very much, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his willingness to work with the co-chairs of the Meth Caucus. It has been exhilarating that we can get something done; and the Meth Caucus, with your help, is making strides. I appreciate it very much.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his strong leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I represent Iowa. Sometimes we have referred to it as the Belt Buckle of the Heartland. Iowa is a small State, one that prides itself on a shared sense of community and responsibility, one that values a solid education and a hard day's work. When one thinks of Iowa, they might imagine vast fields of corn or soybeans, or they might imagine a small-town Main Street.

Unfortunately, they might also imagine meth. A couple of years ago, the meth epidemic in Iowa was highlighted in a documentary by HBO called "Crank." This detailed the meth problem of three Iowa families and showed the complete destruction this drug causes. This documentary shows how meth had taken hold in Iowa, but it just as easily could have been filmed in Missouri, Illinois, California, Washington, Oregon, Oklahoma, Nebraska, or any other State in the Union that has seen meth steadily infiltrate our communities.

I am sure everyone in this great House has heard the stories from their districts about meth. Meth does not care how much money you have, what kind of education you have, where you live, what color your skin is, how old you are, how young you are. Meth is quite simply an equal-opportunity destroyer. I am sure all of my colleagues here have seen all the pictures repeatedly shown by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) which have shown the life of this young woman and how she deteriorated so fast.

I rise today in strong support of the Chabot-Boswell-Calvert-Cannon-Larsen amendment. This amendment will strengthen the ONDCP reauthorization bill by highlighting the continued commitment of this House in our national fight against methamphetamine.

Meth presents unique challenges to law enforcement, social services, and public health agencies. As such, the Congress must have extensive information on this epidemic from across the Nation. I believe this amendment will move us in that direction. By commissioning the reports outlined in this amendment, the Congress will be able to increase the information available to it on a wide range of issues, from the differing State precursor control laws to the Drug Endangered Children pro-

grams that have become all too valuable to the people we represent.

Furthermore, we must have the ability to quickly share information with Federal, State, and local governments. The National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse created by this amendment will provide us with the one-stop shop we need to share information on best practices in areas such as law enforcement, treatment, prevention, and social services.

The proposals in this amendment before you were crafted with close bipartisan cooperation and consultation. When dealing with the issue of meth, I have found this is the only approach to take. This drug does not care what side of the aisle you are on.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who has been such a strong leader in the fight against drugs in this country.

□ 1300

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio on the Judiciary Committee for his great work on this and so many other issues, on constitutional issues and on crime issues in this country, and I want to put this amendment a little bit in context.

First, we have a very strong Meth Caucus in this House, led by Congressman LARSEN, Congresswoman BOSWELL, Congressman CALVERT, and Congressman CANNON. Congressman CALVERT was one of the early leaders because in California we saw these super labs, just like in Washington State and Oregon. Actually, they started in Hawaii. Moved from Asia into Hawaii, into the west coast, into the Plains, then into the Great Lakes States. It has now moved through the whole country.

Part of the reason the Meth Caucus is so frustrated and you will see so many amendments today, and even in the overriding bill, is because of an exasperation that while this is tearing up the grass roots, the Congress of Counties in the United States has said it is the number one drug problem in America; we have the HIDTAs coming in and saying it is, State and local law enforcement coming in and saying it is, the emergency rooms reflecting that, yet there has been no coordinated anti-meth strategy.

The challenge we have when we do a bill like this, which is a 5-year bill, which may mean at different times that oxycontin may be the problem, crack is in other cities and heroin is in other cities, that you try not to micromanage any particular drug in a 5-year bill. But what has happened here is, because the Office of ONDCP in particular, as well as HHS for the most part, have had a tin ear and not responded, this bill is going to have a lot more micromanagement in it than you normally would in a 5-year authorization.

I believe methamphetamine will be around in 5 years. I don't believe we are going to get rid of it in 5 years. It originally was in the form of crack and was not that widespread. But as it spread, whether it is mom-and-pop labs or crystal meth, it will be here for 5 years. But this would not be necessary if they already had a clearinghouse. I can't believe we don't already have a clearinghouse. It wouldn't be necessary if we already had in the schools different programs like this amendment is prescribing.

The administration this morning said they oppose this bill because it ties their hands too much. I am sorry, when you do not respond to the crisis in America, when the American people are rising up in every county, every law enforcement organization, this is exactly what we need to do in legislation when you do not respond.

I strongly support this amendment and I hope the entire Congress will support this amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), another leader in the Meth Caucus.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment today, and I want to thank my fellow Meth Caucus cochairs, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CANNON, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for their work in drafting this critical amendment.

Methamphetamine is a highly dangerous drug that is wreaking havoc on families and communities throughout this country. The drug's use is spreading across the United States. And while meth produced in home-grown labs has actually decreased in certain parts of the country, meth use has exploded with the availability of crystal meth from superlabs from places like Mexico.

Meth impacts every aspect of our community, every aspect of our neighborhoods, of our businesses, of the environment, and of our children. According to a 2005 survey by the National Association of Counties, 58 percent of the counties across the country reported meth as their greatest drug problem. The Federal Government needs to treat our Nation's meth problem with the same urgency and commitment that our State and local governments have been treating it for years.

We must provide for local law enforcement, treatment professionals, and prevention experts with the tools they need to combat this deadly drug. Our amendment is a step in the right direction. For the past several years, the Meth Caucus has worked to engage the Office of National Drug Control Policy on this issue. We have tried to get their attention that meth requires a strong, comprehensive Federal policy. While some gains have been made, ONDCP must take meth more seriously

and devote more resources to its eradication.

Our amendment calls on ONDCP to increase reporting on several critical meth issues, including State Drug Endangered Children programs and State laws and access to meth precursors. These reports will help us develop a coherent and comprehensive national strategy to fight meth. It is also creates the National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse to provide current information to Federal, State, and local agencies about meth's trafficking, abuse, treatment, and abuse prevention.

I want to conclude quickly by thanking the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for working with us to craft this important amendment. I also want to thank him for his willingness to work with the Meth Caucus to get good meth policy passed. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just say this.

I want to congratulate Mr. CHABOT and all the members of the Meth Caucus, because I think they have done, I know that they have done an outstanding job. I certainly congratulate Mr. SOUDER, too.

We have seen meth and the effects of meth, and I can tell you that while I am from the inner city of Baltimore, I have seen the effect that crack cocaine and heroin and various other drugs have had on populations; but I was, to be very frank with you, a bit shocked at the effects of methamphetamines. I think the thing that struck me tremendously was the fact that these drugs could be easily manufactured and that somebody could actually, literally, look at a Web site and put together these drugs and the next thing you know you have got quite a few people using them.

We had testimony that came forward during one of our field hearings in Indiana, I think it was, where they were talking about how one person would learn how to create the lab, and then the next thing you know, they teach somebody else, and they teach somebody else, and the next thing you have a whole string of them.

I give Mr. SOUDER and all the members of our subcommittee a lot of credit. We try to address all of these problems, whether it is meth in the rural areas of our great country, or whether it is crack cocaine in urban areas. And here, this is another effort, as I said a little earlier, for us to address the problems of drugs in our country and the fact that it is destroying so many families, so many communities, and so many people.

A lot of people don't realize it, but when somebody becomes addicted to a

drug, it not only affects them but it affects their families and it affects support agencies and it affects their entire neighborhood. And we have seen those effects.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and I congratulate the sponsors.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief, but I want to thank all the Members that have been so involved in passing this particular amendment and working on the entire bill. There are an awful lot of people, I think, in the House that realize what a scourge drugs are in this country and particularly in the last few years with methamphetamine.

This bill, whereas it is not a panacea, it will not solve the problem, it is at least a step in the right direction, and I want to thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment which will strengthen the Office of National Drug Control Policy's, and in turn our nation's, efforts against methamphetamine—the deadliest and most devastating drug that faces our communities today. As a founding member and Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamine, commonly known as the Meth Caucus, I have seen our Caucus membership enrollment grow just as the meth epidemic has grown.

From a couple dozen Members representing Western states in 2001 to 140 today, the Meth Caucus membership hails from all regions of this country and across the political spectrum. Even the Senate has established their own Meth Caucus which is modeled after the House caucus. Each of these Members recognize the meth epidemic that is ravaging our communities on so many levels—from its toll on individual users, to the significant social costs it thrusts onto our law enforcement, prisons, hospitals, social and child welfare systems, and the environment.

As Mr. CHABOT stated, the amendment, through commissioned studies and reports, will provide information critical to assisting the Administration and the Congress in developing necessary and up-to-date policies to address the meth epidemic. In addition, the amendment would create an online National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse to serve law enforcement and the broader community with a forum for sharing of "best practices" information regarding successful anti-meth programs and activities. These measures will only strengthen the reauthorization bill and ensure that the Federal response to the meth epidemic does not waver.

I would like to express many thanks to Congressman SOUDER for his support on this amendment. He has been, with his staff, relentless in their work to improve federal drug control policy and I appreciate their readiness and eagerness to involve the Meth Caucus in their activities. I also want to thank Congressman CHABOT and his staff for shepherding this important amendment to the floor, and also my fellow Meth Caucus Co-Chairs, Representatives CANNON, LARSEN and BOSWELL and their staff for their constant vigilance on this

issue and their efforts to make this one of the most proactive and effective Caucus' in the House. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment and the reauthorization bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. CUELLAR:

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(n) STUDY OF PERSONS KIDNAPPED, KILLED, AND MISSING ALONG THE BORDER BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall study the specific impact on citizens of the United States of violence related to drug-trafficking along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report, including recommendations on methods to solve the offenses described in such paragraph and to reduce the occurrence of such offenses.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, and I also rise in favor of this particular bill. I want to thank Mr. SOUDER for the leadership he has taken on this very important bill that is so important to us and, again, Mr. CUMMINGS, also for the work you both have been doing, your leadership and your bipartisan approach.

I also want to thank my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for co-sponsoring this amendment. My amendment to H.R. 2829 directs a study on the incidence of kidnapped, killed, and missing Americans along the United States-Mexican border. Within 180 days, the commission will submit a report to the U.S. Congress with recommendations on how to prevent these types of crime.

According to the FBI, 41 Americans have been kidnapped in Mexico since August of 2004. Two have been killed, some have been returned, but there are still 22 missing Americans that we have not been able to find answers to.

Last year, we witnessed a positive reaction from our country when we mobilized the resources to find the missing American in Aruba. It is my hope that we can also give the same type of attention to the missing Americans along the U.S.-Mexican border where many more people have gone missing.

I fully understand that the Office of National Drug Control Policy is not an enforcement or investigative agency, but I believe, very strongly, that this office can be another group of minds that can help us try to find initiatives to help prevent American citizens from suffering the same or similar fate in the future.

Since I have taken office, I have been asked by many of the mothers and fathers and the children of the missing Americans to help resolve the status of their loved ones. I believe that if we bring in many resources together that we can help to ensure we put a stop to these crimes, and hopefully give the families of these missing Americans some closure.

Again, congratulations to Mr. SOUDER for the leadership that he has taken, and Mr. CUMMINGS also, for coming together in a bipartisan approach. I believe this amendment is acceptable to both Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I strongly support this amendment by the gentleman from Texas. Without a doubt, our number one challenge is the southwest border, whether it is meth, whether it is cocaine, whether it is heroin, or whether it is marijuana.

The biggest bust in my hometown's history in Fort Wayne, Indiana, was in Laredo, headed up to Fort Wayne, and a very organized thing. We have had multiple hearings in El Paso, but I remember at one of the hearings in El Paso, the prisons in El Paso are full of people trying to ship drugs to other parts of the country, and they do not even arrest people with under 200 pounds anymore because their prisons are full. When we challenged that, he said, what are we supposed to do in Texas? Our prisons are full of people running drugs to Indiana and Maryland and Florida and everywhere else in the United States. There is only so much we can do.

Many problems along the border are related to immigration questions, but I do not think the violence in the southwest border is related to people coming

up to work in manufactured housing in Indiana. The problem with violence at the southwest border is pretty directly related to drug trafficking; the assassinations we have seen on both sides of the border and how that spills in. Sometimes it is accidental, sometimes it is shootouts, sometimes it is kidnappings, sometimes it relates to people in law enforcement and other times it is individuals; whether it is at that Tohono O'odham reservation in Arizona that has been overrun, or whether it is ranches that have been overrun, or whether literally in El Paso it is assassinations that have occurred inside the city.

The drug czar's office does have the ability to do this kind of study. They are the overarching agency. We may also need to look, just like we need to look at legislation on these tunnels, what specific legislation may need to come from this, but first we need to know what the facts are. I appreciate the gentleman bringing the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I wanted to just state that I wholeheartedly support the amendment. I think it makes a great bill an even better bill, and I thank the gentleman for sponsoring it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas to close.

Mr. CUELLAR. Yes, I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS once again for their leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. FILNER:

Page 159, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(3) SPECIFIC CONTENT RELATED TO DRUG TUNNELS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—The Southwest Border Counter-narcotics Strategy shall include—

(A) a strategy to end the construction and use of tunnels and subterranean passages that cross the international border between the United States and Mexico for the purpose of illegal trafficking of drugs across such border; and

(B) recommendations for criminal penalties for persons who construct or use such a tunnel or subterranean passage for such a purpose.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House resolution 713, the gentleman

from California (Mr. FILNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Chairman SOUDER and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for bringing us this bill, and I have an amendment based on my experience as the Congressman that represents the whole California-Mexico border.

Just a few weeks ago, we discovered almost a mile-long tunnel, half on each side of the border, in my district. We all like to take credit for things in our district, but this is one that I do not take credit for.

□ 1315

It was a very sophisticated tunnel the way it was constructed, the way it was shored up, the way it drained water, and it was even air-conditioned. We found 2 tons of marijuana that was left behind. Who knows what went through that tunnel, whether it was people, drugs or potentially weapons of mass destruction?

Thinking about that and looking at the reaction we had in San Diego over those tunnels, I thought we should slightly amend this bill to authorize the ONDCP to coordinate with all relevant agencies to combat border tunnels that are used to smuggle drugs, people, and could potentially be used to smuggle terrorists and their weapons, specifically between California and Mexico.

It gives the office authority to join in the development and implementation of a strategy to fight these subterranean border tunnels and requires that the office submit to Congress a recommendation for penalties for those involved either in digging or using these tunnels.

We have been dealing with this issue over many years. Eight tunnels between San Diego and Tijuana have been discovered this year alone, and there have been over 20 tunnels discovered in the last decade.

We know that with all of the fences that we are building, double fences, triple fences, walls, what we have here is an easy way under all of those fences that we are building. So we need to have a far more coordinated policy. There is not even a law against tunneling under the border! There are laws for smuggling and for other parts of the crime, but not specifically for tunneling under our international border. So we have to take note of them. We have to concentrate and focus our efforts. We have to understand that terrorism can find a whole new approach to getting into the United States through these tunnels underneath our international border. They are a threat to us and America. They allow drugs and people to come through.

These are busy times for the Border Patrol, the customs agents, immigration folks; but if we are going to send

these agencies to fight a war on drugs, to fight a war against illegal behavior, we have to send them the proper tools. I believe this amendment will do it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to support this amendment. I do not oppose this amendment. I think it is a good amendment. It is a phenomenon we have dealt with for some time, and I appreciate Mr. FILNER's long, aggressive leadership with how best to deal with the southwest border in his district. We have worked together on border questions.

This has recently been in the news because there have been more tunnels discovered in the last period than we have had for some time. The gentleman is absolutely correct, it does not do any good to build fences if you dig tunnels underneath them. Some of these tunnels have gone into other businesses, some into homes, some into open areas. It has shown a gap in our legislation.

I am working with Chairman DREIER who is taking the lead on a bill similar to Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator KYL's bill to try to come up with appropriate laws that we need regarding these tunnels.

Clearly, if you catch the ton of marijuana going through, that is clearly a violation of the law; but even the tunnel itself and digging the tunnel under an international border should have stiff penalties.

I spoke yesterday with the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Julie Myers, and she is head of ICE and has been working directly with them in trying to do more of the tunnel enforcement. They have stepped up DHS efforts, and Assistant Secretary Myers is fully aware of this. We need to develop whatever legislation is required.

What we need is our ONDCP director, and ideally he would have already submitted proposals to us. This says come up with proposals, and it gives him authority to develop implementation of a strategy and coordinate the other agencies. Some of this may be Department of Justice, EPA. That is why we have an Office of National Drug Control Policy to coordinate the different agencies that may be involved in this tunnel.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on these issues, for coming personally to the border to see the situation. Through my district, Mr.

Chairman, every day 300,000 people go back and forth legally. That is the movement of a major amount of people, and we have to do that efficiently. But within that amount of movement, people take advantage with illegal movement. That is what we have to try to get at. We have to try to get at the illegal while making it efficient for all of those people going back and forth for trade, shopping, family visits, for schooling, for cultural visits. We have to allow that to continue efficiently while stopping, in a more efficient fashion, the illegal activity.

I thank both Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SOUDER for their support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a wonderful and very appropriate amendment. I think many Americans were shocked when they learned of this tunnel. As Mr. FILNER said, heaven knows what may have gone through it.

But I see another benefit, not only dealing with the drug issue, but certainly we are concerned about making sure that our homeland is properly secure. As he said, 300,000 to 400,000 people go across the borders legitimately every day. The fact with someone or any persons coming up with this scheme by which to go around the system that we have created, it cries out for ONDCP to look at it and I am sure other agencies are looking at it, too.

I support the amendment and thank the gentleman for offering it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. GRAVES:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED METHAMPHETAMINE CONFERENCE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report explaining the rationale and circumstances leading to the sponsorship by the Department of Health and Human Resources, and the participation by employees of such department, in a conference conducted by the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project on August 19th and 20th, 2005, in Salt Lake City, Utah, titled the "1st National Conference on Methamphetamine, HIV, and Hepatitis Science & Response".

(b) ADDITIONAL MATTERS COVERED.—The report shall include a description of the management and reporting systems of the Office of National Drug Control Policy that are in

place or that will be put in place to ensure that the policy of the Federal Government is consistently supportive of efforts to prevent the use of methamphetamine.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to tell you about the epidemic abuse of methamphetamine that has swept this country. It has devastated States such as mine. Missouri has one of the worst meth problems in the country. From 1995 to 2002, Missouri reported a 97.4 percent increase in methamphetamine-related admissions to emergency rooms. In 2003, Missouri had the highest number of meth lab seizures in the country.

Missouri is not alone. Meth abuse impacts every community; there is no State where meth cannot be found. In 2005 alone, approximately 5,000 meth labs were seized by law enforcement officials. This serious epidemic requires a serious response, and I believe we have to ensure that all agencies are vigorously fighting the meth epidemic.

This includes agencies such as Department of Health and Human Services. HHS sponsored and participated in a conference promoting the ideology of reducing the negative impact of drugs, or the safe use of drugs, rather than stopping the use of illegal drugs.

We need to take seriously the meth epidemic sweeping our Nation. Now is not the time to be lax on drug enforcement. We need to take a hard approach to fight this menace and ensure that the administration and agencies are taking the meth epidemic seriously and supporting efforts to prevent drug abuse, not the safe use.

My amendment is very simple. My amendment will demand that the Office of National Drug Control Policy conduct a report to explain how it happened that the Department of Health and Human Services sponsored this pro-meth conference and what management and reporting systems the Office of National Drug Control Policy will change to ensure that the Department of Health and Human Services is anti-meth and supportive of efforts fighting the meth epidemic.

I ask all Members to support this amendment. This is a serious issue in combating a very dangerous drug, and obviously the meth epidemic.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Graves amendment requires ONDCP to produce a study on why the Department of Health and Human Services provided sponsorship support and sent HHS employees to a 2005 conference on methamphetamine and harm reduction.

In my opinion this amendment is totally unnecessary. The information sought could be obtained through regular oversight channels, and the request does not belong in an authorization statute. In addition, the amendment is an implicit ideological attack on harm-reduction efforts, such as needle exchange programs.

The purpose of needle exchange programs is to reduce the risk of transmission of HIV among injection drugs users. The amendment presupposes that needle exchange and prevention are incompatible, and that HHS participation in a harm-reduction conference cannot be constructive. That assumption is simply false.

HHS, the National Institutes of Health, the World Health Organization, and other health organizations have conducted comprehensive reviews of the research on needle exchange. Their research establishes the following conclusions: Needle exchange programs reduce the risk of transmission of HIV among injection drug users; they do not increase or encourage drug use; and they can be an important bridge to treatment aimed at achieving abstinence from drug use. Needle exchange can be an effective component of a strong, comprehensive drug reduction program. HHS and its drug prevention agencies have valuable expertise. HHS can and should provide information on treatment and prevention in settings where those subjects are discussed. For those reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) be able to reclaim the balance of his time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It is not going to take much. It will just ask that the National Office on Drug Control Policy explain to us their participation in this conference and show us that they are serious about the fight on drugs, they are serious about fighting this epidemic. It gives a report to Congress. That is all it does.

I would like an explanation for this action. I would like an explanation for what took place. Again, it is a very simple amendment, and I do not think it is asking too much.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, we will include for the RECORD a series of letters that we have written to Secretary Leavitt. One of the panels on this conference was: We Do Not Need a War on Methamphetamine.

Another title was: You Don't Have to Be Clean and Sober or Even Want to Be.

Sexual topics were also there. Harm Reduction: Tweaking Tips For Party Boys; Barebacking: A Harm Reduction Approach Without Condoms; Harm Reduction: Unprotected Sex, Gay Men and Barebacking.

It was awful, done with our tax dollars. But what is particularly outrageous, when we look at narcotics, is how can our Department of HHS be participating in something named "We Don't Need a War on Methamphetamine." That is why we are asking ONDCP to investigate this.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I reiterate. I think there are other ways to get this information. What is said during these conferences is not the responsibility of HHS, and I just think when we are in a situation where we are trying to make sure that we use our tax dollars efficiently and effectively, to go at trying to acquire this kind information through this method, an amendment on a very significant bill, I think is just inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

That is exactly what we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is just ask that taxpayer dollars be used responsibly and not for conferences such as this. We need to fight drugs, not show people that they can be used in a safe manner. I think that is ridiculous.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I submit these letters to further illustrate the matter raised by Mr. GRAVES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, August 12, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

It has been my understanding, from several sources, that the Department of Health and Human Services has been the principal barrier preventing the Administration from formulating a policy to address the methamphetamine epidemic. And now I have learned that the Department of Health and Human Services is a primary sponsor of a conference controlled by the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project in your home state of Utah, on August 19 and 20, 2005.

I find this all to be deeply offensive.

I am enormously frustrated with your Department for dithering on the meth issue while the rest of America fights an epidemic that is viciously tearing apart families and communities throughout the country.

A foundational premise of the so-called "harm reduction" ideology promoted at the HHS-sponsored conference is that we should not be fighting a "war on drugs," but rather limiting drugs' harmful effects. Harm reduction is, in fact, a vehicle drug legalization proponents have hijacked to pave the way to their ultimate objective.

Any claim that your Department is unaware of the pro-legalization agenda and "soft" approach to illegal narcotics of the

harm reduction advocates is utterly implausible. This agenda is readily apparent from the conference topics sprinkled throughout the program, as well as the very websites of the assorted harm reduction organizations sponsoring and participating in the conference.

Shockingly, Major Session IV of the HHS-sponsored Harm Reduction Coalition and Harm Reduction Project conference next week is entitled, "We Don't Need a 'War' on Methamphetamine."

Other conference topics include, "You Don't Have to Be Clean & Sober. Or Even Want to Be!" and sexual topics consistent with the harm reduction ideology that shuns an abstinence-based approach for at-risk communities: "Tweaking Tips for Party Boys," and two sessions on engaging in sex without condoms, "Barebacking: A Harm Reduction Approach," and "Without Condoms: Harm Reduction, Unprotected Sex, Gay Men and Barebacking."

Among the speakers and moderators at this conference sponsored by your Department, five are identified in the program as representatives of the Drug Policy Alliance, giving seven presentations at the conference. The Drug Policy Alliance describes itself as "the nation's leading organization working to end the war on drugs." Along with its major donor George Soros, the Drug Policy Alliance helped produce *It's Just a Plant*, a pro-marijuana children's book. Marsha Rosenbaum, who is also presenting at the HHS-sponsored conference, wrote the epilogue for this disturbing book.

Both the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project are partners with the Drug Policy Alliance for its upcoming 2005 International Drug Policy Reform Conference. According to the Alliance's conference materials regarding who should attend this meeting: "Anyone who believes the war on drugs is doing more harm than good!"

The program for the HHS-sponsored conference next week also includes a "Special Thank You" to a handful of people, including HHS employee Dr. Glen Hanson, of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). As you know, NIDA's mission is "to lead the Nation in bringing the power of science to bear on drug abuse and addiction." To what end is the Department's goal to "lead the nation" with harm reduction and drug legalization partners?

Luciano Colonna, Executive Director of the Harm Reduction Project and host of the DHHS-sponsored conference, and one reported as briefing your aides in advance of the conference, is quoted as stating that, "For a lot of people, meth use is a rite of passage and it really does increase sexual pleasure."

That Administration officials from your Department are consulting with harm reduction advocates such as Colonna, and sponsoring conferences controlled by the harm reduction network, completely undermines the work of the President, the Congress, and the men and women who work in law enforcement across the nation who are trying desperately to fight the meth epidemic.

Please provide the following materials no later than 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 16, 2005:

(1) An official statement of why the Department of Health and Human Services is sponsoring the August 19-20 Harm Reduction conference in Salt Lake City, and how such participation furthers the Administration's stated goal of reducing drug use.

(2) The names of all Department of Health and Human Services staff attending the August 19-20 Harm Reduction conference in Salt Lake City, and their contact information so we may conduct staff interviews.

Please provide the following materials no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, August 26, 2005:

(1) All documents relating to the Department of Health and Human Services' involvement, including its role as a primary sponsor, for the August 19-20 Harm Reduction conference in Salt Lake City. See the attachment for a full definition of "documents" and "relating to."

Mr. Secretary, I have steadily worked for enhanced treatment and prevention funding and expanded treatment options. I was the House sponsor of the Drug Addiction Treatment Expansion Act just signed by President Bush. Treatment and prevention are not the issue here.

The issue is that the Administration has not yet put forth a strategy to address the meth epidemic, and your Department bears much of the responsibility for that failure. To procrastinate further while supporting the very people who advocate relaxed drug laws is unconscionable.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, Government Reform Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, August 19, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

Your August 17, 2005 response to my letter regarding the sponsorship by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) of this week's Harm Reduction Coalition/Harm Reduction Project "methamphetamine" conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, simply does not answer the questions I asked. In fact, it raises many more serious questions.

First, and most importantly, I am incredulous that, even as you insist that HHS is not "sponsoring" the conference, you admit that HHS provided taxpayer dollars for it, and that you are sending six employees to participate in it. I would like to learn how it is that you differentiate between providing financing and employees for an event, and "sponsoring" it.

In fact, I am inclined to agree with one of the event's primary organizers, Mr. Luciano Colonna, who told a reporter, "They [HHS] were a sponsor and still are sponsors. If they weren't sponsors, why didn't they just say that nationally when attacked by Souder last week?" I further note that, as of Friday, August 19, 2005 at 9 a.m., the first day of the conference, your Department's name remains on the conference program.

Your Department's support for, and participation in, this conference has already served to confer undeserved legitimacy on the drug legalization proponents who organized it. HHS participation and public sponsorship of the conference influenced the judgment of other government entities. For example, Oklahoma state agencies originally planned to send officials to the conference in large part because of the federal government's sponsorship.

Second, you did not respond to the second stated request of my letter asking for the names of all HHS staff attending the Harm Reduction Conference. This request stands and is reiterated at the end of this letter.

I am, moreover, bewildered by your assertion that six Centers for Disease Control (CDC) employees will attend the conference "to learn how to reduce methamphetamine use." This conference, as the organizers clearly state, concerns so-called "harm reduction", that is, drug use maintenance. That is quite different from drug use reduction.

I believe that your Department's participation in this conference is a slap in the face to the federal, state, and local law enforcement, child welfare services, treatment and prevention, and other personnel who work so hard to stop meth trafficking, abuse, and addiction, and to clean up the wreckage left by this terrible drug.

To give you a specific example, Danni Lentine, one of the CDC employees, will be moderating a panel discussion at the conference entitled, "Demythologizing Methamphetamine Manufacture: Don't Believe the Hype" on Saturday, August 20. The very title of this "discussion" suggests that the law enforcement and child welfare services personnel, who have provided moving testimony to my Subcommittee of the deadly health hazards posed to police officers and children at meth lab sites, are perpetrating a "myth". That, Mr. Secretary, is disturbing, particularly when the Administration has proposed drastic cutbacks in federal programs that help state and local law enforcement agencies find and deal with meth lab sites.

Yesterday, you joined Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez and Director John Walters of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and announced your support for the Administration's anti-meth proposals. Your words, however, ring rather hollow when your Department is providing aid and support for the very people who undermine antimeth policies.

I am attaching the same questions I put to you last week. I request that you provide the answers as soon as possible.

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Ms. HOOLEY:

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(n) REQUIREMENT FOR METHAMPHETAMINE STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from methamphetamine.

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The strategy shall include—

(A) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(B) demand reduction and treatment;

(C) alternative development programs;

(D) efforts to prevent the diversion of precursor chemicals on an international level; and

(E) an assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary to significantly to reduce the production and trafficking of methamphetamine.

(3) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant Federal agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, foreign, or international agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman SOUDER for all of his incredibly hard work that he has done on methamphetamine and all the work he has done in committee.

In my three decades of public service, I do not think I have ever seen a problem as pervasive or as damaging as the methamphetamine epidemic that is sweeping our country. This epidemic is tearing apart families, neighborhoods, communities. More and more States are taking action to cut off pseudoephedrine sales to methamphetamine manufacturers who cannot make this poison without this common-cold medication.

While a number of States, including Oregon, have enacted tough rules to control the availability of pseudoephedrine, this has become a national problem. The States need strong Federal support if we are going to have a fighting chance against this epidemic, and yet this administration and ONDCP have not focused on the drug as they should.

The meth epidemic is impacting all of us. Children in particular can face some of the most devastating effects, with tens of thousands of children suffering the consequences of their family meth habit. When parents crash after speeding on meth, their children are left to fend for themselves, sometimes for days. Parents can become abusive, and their children are exposed to highly toxic chemicals. The cost is overwhelming both in terms of human lives and financial resources needed to take care of our children.

Meth also brings increased crime to a community. A district attorney in Clackamas County, which is in my district, estimates that 99 percent of all ID thefts and 90 percent of all property crimes are related to meth.

This amendment would require the Office of National Drug Control Policy to submit to Congress a comprehensive strategy to address the increased threat of methamphetamine. The strategy would include interdiction and precursor chemical controls, demand reduction and treatment, efforts to pre-

vent the diversion of precursor chemicals on an international level, and an assessment of the funding and resources necessary to significantly reduce the production and trafficking of methamphetamine.

ONDCP must make fighting meth a top priority, and this amendment would ensure that they did. The spreading of methamphetamine is a multifaceted problem ranging from the mom-and-pop labs to the sophisticated illegal drug factories in foreign countries. It is one that requires a multifaceted solution. We must take action to control the supply of, and access to, its ingredients both on a domestic and international level, which we have begun to do with the Combat Meth Act. But we also need to reduce the demand for this drug by educating our youth about the dangers of methamphetamine and ensure that addicts get the treatment they need.

The stated role of the Office of National Drug Control Policy is to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for the Nation's drug-control program. Their job is to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, and trafficking, drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences; and yet they refuse to devote the resources or attention that is needed to fight our meth epidemic while more and more Americans become addicted to this deadly drug.

As any cop in America will tell you, methamphetamine is destroying our communities; and fighting the production and importation of this dangerous drug has been one of my top priorities as a Member of Congress. It is long past time for ONDCP to join in the fight, and this amendment will require them to do so, so we have a fighting chance in this battle.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not oppose this amendment. It is an excellent amendment. It requires ONDCP in 90 days to come up with a comprehensive strategy addressing the threat of methamphetamine.

In this bill we already require a coordinated strategy to combat South American and Afghan heroin, which we have not had. We already require a Southwest border narcotics strategy, which has not been effective.

But there has been nothing on meth, and this not only requires a strategy for the supply side, how it gets in internationally through the border, but the demand side as well. The National Ad Campaign has basically been absent, part of the ONDCP, on the meth issue; yet we have reduced the funding

here. But this House clearly showed they would increase the funding on the National Ad Campaign if they put it in meth, and then they wonder why they cannot get more dollars for the National Ad Campaign.

We have had to do meth hot spots to try to address that at the grass-roots. That was opposed by the administration. We have now authorized that as part of the terrorism bill in the Combat Meth Act. An amazing individual in the State of Montana has put together a private sector program that is more effective in fighting meth than we have been able to come up with in the public sector.

This amendment will help direct and force the Department of ONDCP, the drug czar's office, to address in a coordinated way meth strategy.

I commend the gentlewoman from Oregon. The Portland Oregonian has been a champion nationally and internationally in identifying this. She has championed this issue in Oregon; as well Congressman WALDEN in the eastern side of Oregon that has been hit so hard; and we really appreciate all the efforts of those in the Northwest as this drug rips through the rest of the country, into Congressman PETERSON of Pennsylvania's district. Titusville, Pennsylvania is the capital of meth in Pennsylvania, ripping into North Carolina. We are doing a hearing with Congressman MCHENRY in the next few weeks. As we see it march into the East, this has now become a national problem; and we appreciate the leadership from the Northwest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I too stand in support of Ms. HOOLEY's amendment. We have spent a tremendous amount of time in our subcommittee on methamphetamine. We see it as a problem that is spreading in many instances like wildfire. And I want to thank Ms. HOOLEY for her leadership and for the amendment.

We have expressed on numerous occasions to the drug czar the fact that we see methamphetamine and addressing the methamphetamine problem should be a major, major priority. And I think that this just helps us along the way with regard to addressing this very significant problem, and again I congratulate the gentlewoman and support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Section 6 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(n) REQUIREMENT FOR AN ASSESSMENT OF ILLICIT DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE BY CHILDREN, AND APPROPRIATE INTERVENTION METHODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall complete an assessment of report materials, studies, and statistics with respect to the 5-year period before the date of enactment of this Act, to determine the extent to which children who are 12 to 17 years of age—

(A) experiment with and regularly use marijuana, alcohol, cigarettes, prescription drugs without a prescription, designer drugs (such as ecstasy), and other illicit drugs (such as cocaine); and

(B) have access to intervention services or programs, including drug testing, counseling, rehabilitation, legal representation, and other services or programs associated with prevention, treatment, and punishment of substance abuse.

(2) ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE.—In completing the assessment under paragraph (1), the Director—

(A) shall consider relevant public health and academic research materials and studies, and may also consider relevant statistics concerning illicit drug and alcohol use, and criminal convictions related to such use; and

(B) shall make findings, based on the information considered under subparagraph (A), regarding the nature and extent of illicit drug and alcohol use among children who are 12 to 17 years of age, and the availability of preventative, intervention, and rehabilitation services and programs to such children.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to Congress regarding the assessment under this subsection and the findings under paragraph (2)(B). Such report shall include, with respect to children who are 12 to 17 years of age, the following information:

(A) Services and programs that have been effective in preventing such children from experimenting with and beginning the regular use of illicit drugs and alcohol.

(B) The extent to which chronic drug and alcohol use occurs in such children.

(C) The extent to which schools and other public institutions provide intervention for such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, the specific roles such schools and institutions play, and the extent to which such interventions are successful.

(D) Additional resources schools and other public institutions need to provide successful intervention to such children, including funding.

(E) The role of Federal agencies in providing intervention to such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, and the extent to which Federal agency intervention is successful.

(F) Additional resources Federal agencies need to provide successful intervention to such children, including funding.

(G) The role of the Federal, State, and local criminal justice systems in providing intervention to such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, and the extent to which criminal justice interventions are successful.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to acknowledge again Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS and certainly the members of the full committee, ranking member Waxman and Chairman DAVIS. We can all have our approaches to dealing with this fast-moving drug crisis in America, and it would seem that in 2006 we might be using other language other than “drug crisis,” because I recall the Select Committee on Narcotics. I was not a Member of this body, but it had a very high profile. That committee, of course, chaired by Congressman RANGEL, was at a time when drug use in urban centers of America was at a fast-moving pace.

My amendment is one that seeks to be a tool for intervention, a guidepost for the right kinds of programs that can affect our youth. This is an amendment that in its simplicity says that we know that drug use among the ages of 12 to 17, and in many instances girls, is going up. The data is clear. We also know that there are many programs, a lot funded by this agency, of course, but we also need to have a complete understanding of the assessment of these programs, how they can be effective in local, State, and Federal governments.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Washington Post article from this past February describes how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at higher rates than boys. The National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that 730,000 girls between the ages of 12 and 17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, compared with 565,000 boys; and 675,000 girls started using marijuana, compared with 577,000 boys; 14.4 percent of girls and 12.5 percent of boys in this study reported misusing prescription drugs; 1.5 million girls started drinking alcohol in 2004, compared to 1.28 million boys.

We also know that our particular communities have seen that at least, if it has not increased, it is still the same. There were 20,692 drug-related arrests in Houston, Texas, in 2003. In their lifetime, 32.9 percent of female and 48.9 percent of male Houston-area high school students will have a lifetime use of marijuana. In 2000 there were 115,589 Federal arrests made, 28 percent for drug offenses; 10.8 percent of youth 12 to 17 years old have used drugs in the past month alone. Among State prisoners, 83.9 percent were involved in alcohol or drugs at the time of their offenses; 53 percent of high school seniors reported using an illicit drug at least once in their lives.

These numbers are good for the record, but they impact people's lives. And frankly I believe that we have an

opportunity to assess and report back to Congress on the programs that have been effective in preventing or responding to drug and alcohol use, the extent to which chronic use occurs in children, the extent to which schools and public institutions play a role in these programs, and the role of the Federal Government in these programs and the role of the criminal justice system.

Let me say that I am very grateful that this bill is silent on the issue dealing with scholarships because, unfortunately, we know that children and young people have used drugs but have straightened their lives up because of these intervention programs, and we want to make sure that they are not then thwarted and stopped from being able to finish their education. This, however, is a program that assesses the right kind of intervention. Certainly we know that we have drug courts. We want to know how effective they are. We know there is an amendment that has focused on that.

This focuses on, really, the kinds of programs that may be offered by nonprofits, the faith community, local governments so that funding can be both direct, correct, and effective.

Our children are our greatest resource. We are finding that they are victims, but also they are ripe for the target. They are ripe for amphetamines. They are ripe for over-the-counter drugs such as cough medicine. They are ripe for raiding their parents' prescription drugs in their medicine cabinet at home. So I am hoping that we can join together and understand the usage of these drugs, the alcohol in particular.

Now, let me make note of the fact that we know that smoking cigarettes or cigarettes and alcohol are legal aspects of potential addiction, but we believe that still the programs that deal with those elements, cigarette smoking, alcohol, are likewise equally involved in the idea of intervention and assessment of what programs work.

Let me conclude by simply saying a life saved, a life off the beaten path put on the straight path, is an investment in America's future. I believe this amendment helps us understand how to invest in America's future.

□ 1345

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Without objection, the gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have some serious reservations with this amendment, not with the goals, but whether many of these studies are not already being conducted. We have tried to work with the gentlewoman from Texas to sort that through. I have agreed to support this amendment and accept this

amendment on the condition that we will continue to work in conference and to the degree there is not duplication, because I agree with two fundamental underlying points. One is that we have seen a rise in drug use among girls and women; in methamphetamine in particular we have seen a startling rise. Secondly, in our prisons, we need to continue to look at that.

I believe there are a number of private sector studies in addition to what ONDCP does that will reach much of that data. But I share her goals, and will continue to work in conference to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly, by the way, support this amendment. Ms. JACKSON-LEE talked about a recent Washington Post article from February 10 describing how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at a higher rate than boys, and then she went on to talk about the national survey on drug use and how it found that some 730,000 girls between the ages of 12-17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, and it got compared with 565,000 boys, and then the 675,000 girls starting to use marijuana compared to 577,000 boys. It seems that there is something going on here that we definitely need to look at.

I know the chairman will work in conference to try to make sure that we address all of these problems. I would definitely support the amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, and I want to thank the chairman very much.

I look forward to making sure as we work our way to conference and through conference that we, too, have an effective amendment that addresses the concerns that we are all mutually concerned about: this ascending rate of usage by girls and boys, but by girls, and, of course, making sure we have an assessment of the effective programs. I look forward to working with the chairman, and I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, and fellow members of the committee, I would like to draw your attention to an amendment that I think is crucial in ensuring the effectiveness of our Office of National Drug Control Policy domestically. A recent Washington Post article from February 10 described how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at higher rates than boys. The National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that 730,000 girls between the ages of 12 and 17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, compared with 565,000 boys, and 675,000 girls started using marijuana, compared with 577,000 boys. In this study, 14.4 percent of girls and 12.5 percent of boys reported misusing prescription drugs. In 2004, 1.5 million girls started drinking alcohol compared with 1.28 million boys.

This is appalling, and saddening, and my amendment would directly address this by asking the Director of the ONDCP to assess

the drug usage by children, as well as the existing preventive and treatment programs.

We can't let our children poison themselves—but in order to take decisive and effective action, we must know more about what the current situation is, and inform our decisionmaking. I hope you will agree that this is an urgent issue, and that this amendment begins the search for a solution.

Thank you for your consideration and your support, and thank you Mr. Chairman.

Rebuttal to the argument that the National Youth Media Campaign addresses this issue and the amendment would be redundant:

This amendment first and foremost requires the ONDCP to document and produce solid research on the occurrence of this problem nationwide. At this point in time, we have a single survey and anecdotal evidence. I think it is crucial to get the ONDCP to take responsibility for this issue and begin to inform decisionmakers.

The amendment specifies items to assess that were not considered by the National Survey on Drug Use and Health such as the role of Federal, State, and local criminal justice systems in providing interventions.

I would like to believe that the ONDCP can be considered an authority on matters having to do with drug use and abuse by children, and this amendment simply asks for an assessment and a report to Congress on the matter.

There were 20,692 drug related arrests in Houston in 2003 (ONDCP).

In their lifetime, 32.9 percent of females and 48.9 percent of male Houston area high school students will have a lifetime use of marijuana (ONDCP).

In 2000, there were 115,589 federal arrests made—28 percent for drug offenses.

In the past month alone, 10.8 percent of youth 12-17 years old have used drugs.

Among State prisoners, 83.9 percent were involved with alcohol and drugs at the time of their offense.

Fifty-three percent of high school seniors reported using an illicit drug at least once in their lives.

White House office of National Drug Control Policy—130 member group led by John Walters.

Some estimates say that the U.S. consumes 60 percent of the illicit drugs in the world.

Fiscal year 2007 budget request—35 percent for reducing demand of drugs, 65 percent for crackdown of supplies.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(n) MODEL STATE DRUG LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall provide for a corporation that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code to—

(A) advise States on establishing laws and policies to address alcohol and other drug issues, based on the model State drug laws developed by the President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws in 1993; and

(B) revise such model State drug laws and draft supplementary model State laws to take into consideration changes in the alcohol and drug abuse problems in the State involved.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in 1992, while serving as California's attorney general, I was privileged to be appointed by President George H.W. Bush to be a commissioner on the President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws. This was a congressionally established commission that was charged with creating a model code of laws to help States effectively address alcohol and other drug abuse.

This commission conducted a thorough process which included five public hearings, 25 working sessions, travels around the country for that purpose, and input from hundreds of individuals and organizations working at the State and local levels, to address substance abuse.

The result of that commission was 44 model drug laws and policies which offered a comprehensive continuum of responses and services to address substance abuse problems. We had people from various disciplines in the mental health arena, in the law enforcement arena, in the educational arena, in the social services arena, all coming together to see whether or not they could come up with a continuum of responses to this terrible problem.

Since fiscal year 1995, Congress has provided funding for a nonprofit entity to advise States on laws and policies to address alcohol and other drug issues using as its base the model acts crafted by the President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws, to revise these model State drug laws and to draft supplementary model acts to meet changes in State substance abuse problems. They actually work with the States. They work with local governments to come up with these comprehensive approaches.

Having these services available to the States has been an enormous asset in combating substance abuse as States introduce and pass newer enhanced drug laws, create new guidelines and

policies, coordinate funding streams to use resources effectively and efficiently and develop or strengthen multidisciplinary partnerships at the State and local level. That is absolutely necessary if we are going to make real progress on this war on drugs and war on other types of substance abuse. Just look at the number of States that addressed methamphetamine-related problems through legislation this past year alone. Many of them benefited from the services I mentioned.

Because effective and cost-efficient State drug laws and policies are vital components of a strong national effort to address substance abuse, this amendment is offered to authorize appropriations of \$1.5 million for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to better ensure that these key functions in assisting States are retained in the national drug control effort.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment. Mr. LUNGREN of California, who I like to think of as the Charlie Weis of Congress in the sense that since he has come in, he has helped organize us in homeland security and organize us in narcotics issues based on his experience as attorney general, and once again showing why the University of Notre Dame produces such great graduates who grasp the issue.

He has worked at the State level. We need clearer model State drug laws. We need to establish laws that are effective. I appreciate his leadership in this effort in multiple committees, on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, we certainly join in support of the amendment. We think it is a good amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. LYNCH:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and make such conforming changes as may be necessary to the table of contents):

SEC. 20. STUDY ON PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ASSOCIATED WITH IATROGENIC ADDICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall request the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to enter into an agreement under which the Institute agrees to conduct a study examining certain aspects of prescription drugs associated with iatrogenic addiction, including oxycodone hydrochloride controlled-release tablets.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study conducted pursuant to this section shall evaluate—

(1) the rate and impact of iatrogenic addiction associated with the use of prescription drugs described in subsection (a); and

(2) the relative addictiveness of prescription drugs described in subsection (a) when compared with other opioids and other substances included in schedule I or II of the schedules of controlled substances established by section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812).

(c) REPORT.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall ensure that the agreement under subsection (a) provides for the submission of a report to the Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the results of the study conducted pursuant to this section.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Maryland on their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered simply requests that the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy ask the Institute of Medicine at the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study to examine certain aspects of iatrogenic addiction, which is associated with prescription drugs like OxyContin.

Back in September, our Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs For Government Reform held a field hearing in Boston and it regarded the regulation of prescription drugs such as OxyContin. One of the primary concerns raised at those hearings by the experts was that they testified that the lack of information on the addictiveness of these type of drugs has created a great problem in society.

For this reason, the amendment calls for a study that would first look at the rate and impact of iatrogenic addiction; that is, addiction to properly prescribed prescription drugs, which is associated with the use of prescription drugs like OxyContin.

Iatrogenic addiction is addiction which occurs as a result of prescribed medical care. These are the accidental addicts, who, through no fault of their own, become hopelessly addicted to drugs like OxyContin, and in effect these individuals become customers for life.

Because there are some legitimate medicinal uses for some of these painkillers, it is increasingly difficult to balance the need of those people who are desperately in need of these drugs, to try to balance that against the problems of addiction. For this reason, it is necessary to have the information on addictiveness of drugs associated with iatrogenic addiction, including OxyContin.

I want to relate briefly, Mr. Chairman, a story of a young woman, and this is just one example of thousands, a young woman in my district from a good family who went to the dentist's office with tooth pain.

After the tooth extraction, she was given a prescription of OxyContin, and, after completing that, exhausting that prescription, she went back again for an additional prescription. Sometime thereafter, she went back in, complaining of additional tooth pain and had another tooth extracted, and again was given another prescription of OxyContin. It happened a third time.

To make a long story short, I met this young woman during an effort to create a detox center in my district, and she confesses now in rehab that she had become addicted to the first couple of prescriptions and she went back, falsely claiming tooth pain, just so she could get additional prescriptions for OxyContin. She became hopelessly addicted to OxyContin through no fault of her own.

Another observation in my own district, it is quite common, traveling to pharmacies in the malls or drugstores in my local downtown area, it is not uncommon to see big signs in the front windows of my pharmacies that say, "We do not carry OxyContin on the premises." In other words, please don't rob us.

There have been so many robberies trying to acquire this drug of addicts that now the pharmacies are just saying we don't carry it on the premises, do not rob us. I think it is a sad statement of the addictive quality of this drug and also our inability to police it.

At this point, there are no studies that help us understand why certain people become addicted, while others don't, to drugs like OxyContin. By conducting this study, we will be better able to understand how the brain interacts with this drug.

Secondly, the study will look at the relative addictiveness of prescription drugs such as OxyContin when compared with other pain killers as well as other controlled substances under Schedule I and Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS again for their leadership on this effort. I think they too are shining examples of bipartisanship on an issue that is very important to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this amendment, it is an excellent amendment, and I wanted to address the subject for a few minutes.

Mr. LYNCH has been a leader in this, as he has also been in the steroids battle, in the committee. I appreciate that. Chairwoman CANDICE MILLER conducted a hearing in his district on this subject. We worked together as committees, although I could not be at the hearing.

We also conducted a hearing on OxyContin down in Orlando. OxyContin has also hit my districts hard. There was a series of bank robberies and other robberies of pharmacies in the area, I think 19 total, that when people become addicted to this or become distributors of it, it can lead to other sorts of crime and organized crime in many areas of the country.

It is a little known fact that cocaine is not the number one killer in America through drug abuse, nor is heroin, nor is methamphetamine. It is abuse of prescription drugs. It is very hard for us, and we are going to see, as we make progress on methamphetamines through our control of pseudoephedrine and trying to get better control of the border at least someday in the future on crystal methamphetamine and some of the other drugs, that legal drugs are going to be possibly our biggest challenge.

One of the struggles with this, as we found out in the hearing in Orlando, that many of the medical community, not only are we fighting the pharmaceutical community, as we did in the methamphetamine bill and pseudoephedrine, we are also fighting the medical community.

Here we got in a very testy exchange about how we define pain control, and that comes as to how we regulate this, and what constitutes one person's pain control may not be another's, and it becomes an excuse for having no regulations on OxyContin.

□ 1400

So we had therapists opposed to us; we had certain medical communities opposed to us, who may have legitimate uses. But the bottom line is that we have an epidemic of abuse occurring with this and other prescription drugs.

We do not need to hear how not to regulate it. What we need to work with these industries is how best to regulate it, and part of that is getting a study on accuracy of how this addiction works. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership with this. I will support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, support this amendment. I want to

thank Mr. LYNCH for his leadership. OxyContin is something that we have taken a look at, and we realize that it has had, as Mr. LYNCH has described, just all kinds of damaging effects. I think that the good thing is that this gives us an opportunity to get more information about it, because I think it is almost impossible to truly make good policy unless you have an adequate amount of information. So I think this will be helpful to our subcommittee as we move forward in trying to address this issue. The interesting thing that we note is it seems as if from time to time, and depending on the area in the country, certain drugs seem to become the drug of the time.

And so what we are constantly trying to do is make sure that we have every bit of detail that we possibly can so that we can create the kind of policies to effectively counter the abuse of certain drugs.

So, again, I applaud Mr. LYNCH. Thank you for bringing this to us. I thank you for yielding me time.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming the balance of my time, as Mr. CUMMINGS just said, this shows the diversity of things that we tackle in our committee, in narcotics areas across the United States. We saw new shocking revelations yesterday on Barry Bonds. Masking agents are increasingly a challenge in trying to deal with steroids and other vitamin supplements and things that people are using in excess quantities to create artificial advantages in competition.

How this thing goes down to young people whose bodies cannot handle this, as we heard in our steroids hearing, watching OxyContin, which is one of the most effective painkillers being used by people, taking people's lives, and it becomes a way that people rob banks and pharmacies and violence in society, abuse of other prescription drugs.

In addition to cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines, different areas will have different things come up at different times. But we need to know the science behind it. We need to know how it affects the human brain. We need to know the best ways to fight this. We need comprehensive efforts.

That is what the Office of National Drug Control Policy is supposed to do. I commend the gentleman and support this amendment from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the last two points in closing: we have had to in my district open up two brand-new adolescent, one adolescent boys facility to deal with this problem and one adolescent girls facility.

I have extensive waiting lists at both facilities trying to deal with this problem. I think that somewhere down the line we have to address the fundamental question in this country about

how addictive, how addictive are we going to let drugs become that are sold over the counter commercially. Because, eventually, we have to realize that there is a commercial advantage to selling an addictive drug.

And those drug companies, they are creating customers for life here who have no other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. PAUL:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. SUNSET.

After section 716, as redesignated by section 14 of this Act, insert the following:

"SEC. 717. SUNSET.

"This Act shall not be in effect after September 30, 2011."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. I thought it would be very noncontroversial, because it merely sunsets our provision. We have just gone through a period of time of 2 years where there has been no authorizations, but we have done appropriations as necessary.

The amendment merely says, this act shall not be in effect after September 30, 2011. So that is 5 years, which I think is very adequate. But I would want to express my agreement with the authors of this particular bill, because we do have a very serious problem in this country with drugs.

I, as a physician, am very much aware of the seriousness of it. I also agree that prescription drugs are probably every bit as bad or much worse, because there is so much dependency on psychotropic drugs.

But, nevertheless, I come down on the side of saying no matter how good legislation like this is, it backfires; there are too many unintended consequences. In such a short period of time, all I can suggest to my colleagues is that prohibition in the ultimate sense was tried with alcohol.

And alcohol is still now a severe problem in this country. And we knew

that Prohibition produced many more problems than the alcohol itself. I think that is true with drugs. I think we have allowed ourselves to be carried away, to a large degree, because now we have laws that lack compassion. We do know, in the medical field, that marijuana can be helpful to cancer patients and AIDS patients can be helped where our drugs are not helpful; and to me this is just sad that we override State laws that permit it.

The overwhelming number of people in the country now are saying that we ought to allow marijuana to be used for very sick patients. Not too long ago, just this week, I had a meeting with a student that came from a central Asian country. He was an exchange student. He says the big subject at his school was, what is the age limit when I can drink alcohol? They would ask him that and he said, there is no age limit.

So I asked him, I said, is there a drinking problem in your country? And he says no. He says it is uneventful. It is the excitement of something being illegal that actually makes the problem a lot worse.

And even in our country, we had a grand experiment from the beginning of our country up until about 35 years ago. We had very few of these laws. Yet all we can notice now is that we have spent, in today's dollars, over \$200 billion in the last 35 years, and we do not have a whole lot to show for it.

So I would grant you there is a serious problem. We should do whatever we can to help. I just do not think more legislation is required.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume. On the surface it looks fairly mild, but it is actually an attempt to eliminate the drug czar's office.

The gentleman from Texas is certainly the most principled Libertarian that we have in the Congress and probably one of the most principled Libertarians in the country. I presume he would favor sunseting most Departments in the Federal Government. The question is, why would we single out the drug czar's office?

We have many programs that are unauthorized. That is an unfortunate thing. I believe all programs should, in fact, be authorized; and that is why we are going through this authorization. It got lost at the end of the last session in the Senate side, and we are proceeding again with Senate support.

It would be tragic if we got in the position where each Department, if Congress could not decide on the exact wording of the authorization bill, the office suddenly disappeared, and we would not have a national anti-drug media, we would not have the HIDTA programs, we would not have the technology that goes forth.

Dr. Paul and I have deep differences on the effectiveness of narcotics. We both share a skepticism in the ability of government to solve things. But I

believe in the drug policy area we can at least make a difference. And I believe it is an important difference.

He and I have our deep philosophical differences on this, but I very much respect his consistent opposition, basically to most legislation that comes forth in front of Congress. But I need to oppose this amendment.

This amendment would have the effect of singling out the Office of National Drug Control Policy solely among Cabinet positions to be put under this regulation. And it could, indeed, like many other programs that we do not get reauthorization, such as juvenile justice, such as Head Start, has at times not had its authorization, we have many different programs that do not get authorized.

We would not want to fold those programs merely because the two bodies could not agree on their final wording.

I also would like to at this time, I got a copy of the administration's statement of policy of why they oppose this bill, in spite of the fact it has gone unanimously through the subcommittee, unanimously through the full committee, gone with complete support of multiple other committees in Congress.

It is, quite frankly, a relatively insulting document. It says, for example, that it infringes on the prerogatives of the executive by designating ONDCP as a Cabinet-level official. As we explained earlier, that is not what the law says it does.

It says it has to be treated like a Cabinet-level position. Which, by the way, was what Congress passed in the beginning. It was a congressional designation. The bill duplicates the drug certification process, is another one of their complaints at the State Department. That is true. But ONDCP is a narcotics agency, and they should be advising the State Department, which has multiple different concerns when they do certification. It complains about the interdiction coordinator in the Department of Homeland Security being under a national drug control strategy, which seems odd that ONDCP would be objecting to this being in their Department.

Once again, it reiterates that they want to move the HDTAs away right now in the Justice Department from ONDCP. The reason we have them there is the State and locals were drawn into HIDTA relationship where they had a vote and could have influence in the decision-making.

The administration's proposals would gut the funding, over half of it; would take away the vote of State and local officials, all of whom said unanimously they would withdraw from the program if the administration persists with this, which was denied in both Houses last year, denied overwhelmingly again by their own people.

When the narcotics officers of America unanimously oppose this, when the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas unanimously oppose it, how can the ad-

ministration keep sending up this type of document? They are supposed to be the leaders of the world on narcotics, not fighting every police officer in America, every State trooper in America, every HIDTA in America. I do not understand this.

It also says that we are reducing its flexibility in the National Anti-drug Media Campaign. We certainly are. Because we are frustrated that they have not dealt with the problem of methamphetamine. So that allegation happens to be true. We are reducing the flexibility because he has refused to respond to the counties of America that methamphetamine is their number one problem in America, to the HDTAs; and particularly he has been after the methamphetamine HDTAs that were created, the Rocky Mountain HIDTA, the Missouri HIDTA, the Iowa HIDTA.

It has been very frustrating to see this persistent, persistent, even after we passed the Methamphetamine Act this past week, even as we moved this bill through, continuing to resist the efforts of Congress to try to tackle the problems of methamphetamine.

Also they dislike that we have restricted their reprogramming ability. Yes we have restricted their reprogramming ability, because every time the local HDTAs or others try to deal with the methamphetamine problem, they want to reprogram the money away from the problem. So we have given them most of the flexibility there.

But while some of their charges are true, they fail to point out why the House and Senate unanimously from both parties are so frustrated that we have had to go forth with this. It would be tragic if my friend from Texas's amendment passed and would not let us move forward with this bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Texas that calls for the sunset of this legislation in 5 years, if enacted.

You know, I have heard a lot from the other side of the aisle about poverty programs that did not work, and I saw a lot of work to get rid of those programs.

This is a program that does not work. We need to get rid of it, and we need to get serious about doing something about drugs in America. We are sitting here talking about these HDTAs. We are talking about advertisements while we have an unprotected border with the drug lords shooting it out with our sheriffs down in Texas and other places, bringing drugs into our country.

HIDTA does nothing to stop that. We have the deaths from overdoses from methamphetamines, crack cocaine, cocaine, pills, Ecstasy, heroin, marijuana, you name it. And we are doing nothing. America can do better than this.

Why should we keep a program without reviewing it, just put it into law forever? This is what you are trying to do. We need to sunset it. Period. As a matter of fact, I would get rid of it; it would not even be authorized. But if you insist, at least review it. Why do you want to put it in law forever without the kind of reviews that are necessary to determine its effectiveness?

□ 1415

This does not work. It is costing the American taxpayers \$870 million to run this ineffective program. I think we should get rid of it, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 2 additional minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I mentioned that prohibition was a total failure with alcohol and that it is very similar, and I think the gentleman from Indiana helped make my point. He is a bit frustrated with the enforcement of the laws on the books, and for what reason I do not know, but we certainly ought to be frustrated with the results. But the laws are difficult to enforce and I understand and sense his frustration with this.

One of the major reasons why I object to this approach is not only the cost. The cost is pretty important and I think it is pretty important to realize it does not work very well, if at all; but we also ought to look at the damage done with our mistaken thoughts that this is doing a lot of good.

Once a war is declared, whether it is a war overseas or whether it is a domestic war on some evil here, that is when the American people should look out for their civil liberties. There, the issue of privacy is attacked. So now we have a war on terrorism and we have the PATRIOT Act and all these other things that intrude on the civil rights and civil liberties of Americans, and, at the same time, not achieving a whole lot of good results.

This is what happens when there is a war on. Those people who are trying to avoid taxes, all law-abiding citizens have to obey all these laws. So as soon as there is a war, look out for your civil liberties and your privacy. The war on drugs has done a great deal of harm to our right of privacy.

Once again, I agree with the argument, there are a great deal of problems in this country with the illegal use of drugs, but what I am saying is it does not help to have this type of a war on drugs because it tends to distort things. It raises prices artificially high.

It causes all kind of ramifications that actually cause more killing and dying. This is why prohibition of alcohol was stopped, because people died from drinking bad alcohol, and the gangs sold the alcohol. The same thing happens today.

Like I mentioned, that student that lived in the country, and he was 16 years old, and there were no rules or laws against teenagers drinking beer or alcohol and there was no problem. Kids did not drink. It was not exciting to do it. So there is a certain element of truth to that. Kids smoking cigarettes is against the law. You sneak off and smoke cigarettes. That happens to be what teenagers do.

So no matter how well-intended legislation like this is, it tends to have too many unintended consequences, it costs too much money. And we fail to realize that we in this country live with a greater amount of personal liberty and respect for State and local law enforcement, we had less drug problems. Think about it. Through the latter part of the 18th century, the 19th century, the early part of the 20th century, essentially no laws, and we had a lot less problems.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, this amendment is whether you support the director's office or not. The fact is that we sunset everything every year, because if we do not appropriate, they do not have any dollars. If it never gets reauthorized and then you do not appropriate, it is sunsetted. We have sunset provisions in every piece of legislation we pass. All we have to do is not fund it. Then they do not have any staff. They do not have any offices. They do not have any rent.

This is a legitimate debate about whether the Federal Government should be involved in drug law enforcement.

I disagree with my colleague from Texas, across the board. We do not even agree on prohibition. Quite frankly, prohibition reduced alcohol abuse. It reduced spouse abuse. It reduced child abuse. People wanted to drink and we had a history of drinking. And it came back in mostly for political reasons, not because of all the other side reasons you have heard. In fact, it accomplished its goals; it just had a side goal, given the history of alcohol use in the United States. And ever since then we have been trying to control it even down to the point of now regulating bartenders who serve drinks to people who have consumed too much.

We still see the ravages of alcohol abuse. We see States that have passed liberal marijuana laws repealing those laws. Denmark and The Netherlands are retreating because when they legalized marijuana, it was not like the drug traffickers disappeared. They just moved to harder drugs and started to

sell those. The marijuana that we see today isn't the ditch weed we used to have in Indiana or the sixties' marijuana. It is this hydroponic marijuana with 30 to 40 percent THC that sells on the streets much like crack cocaine. It has an impact on your brain much like crack cocaine.

The fact is that this is a great danger to this country, that we have made progress. The keen attitudes towards marriage have consistently declined. The cocaine in the United States has shown some movement based on what has happened in Columbia. Right now we have a problem that we cannot control the heroin out of Afghanistan. We are tackling the meth question. In fact, we have seen a broad move across the United States that has reduced drug abuse. It is important that we have a director there. We just want to see the director being more effective.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. REHBERG:

Page 213, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

“(k) PREVENTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE AND OTHER EMERGING DRUG ABUSE THREATS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT TO USE 10 PERCENT OF FUNDS FOR METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE PREVENTION.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated under this section for the national media campaign for a fiscal year, not less than 10 percent shall be expended solely for—

“(A) the activities described subsection (b)(1) with respect to advertisements specifically intended to reduce the use of methamphetamine; and

“(B) grants under paragraph (2).

“(2) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Director may award grants to private entities for purposes of methamphetamine media projects. Any such project—

“(A) shall have as its goal the significant reduction of the prevalence of first-time methamphetamine use among young people; and

“(B) shall focus solely on the prevention of methamphetamine use, through, at a minimum, public service messages that are based on research showing what is effective in substantially reducing such use among young people, including public service messages in both print and electronic media and on websites.

“(3) AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR OTHER DRUG ABUSE UPON CERTIFICATION THAT METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE FELL DURING FISCAL

YEAR 2007.—With respect to fiscal year 2008 and any fiscal year thereafter, if the Director certifies in writing to Congress that domestic methamphetamine laboratory seizures (as reported to the El Paso Intelligence Center of the Drug Enforcement Administration) decreased by at least 75 percent from the 2006 level, the Director may apply paragraph (1)(A) for that fiscal year with respect to advertisements specifically intended to reduce the use of such other drugs as the Director considers appropriate.

Page 213, line 7, strike “(k)” and insert “(l)”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, let me begin by thanking Mr. SOUDER for his tremendous leadership on this issue, and in taking a look at this amendment, this is an extremely important amendment.

What the amendment does is it ensures that no less than 10 percent of the national media campaign funds will be expended on advertisements specifically intended to reduce methamphetamine use, and it allows the director to award grants to private entities.

I heard the joke not long ago that said, creativity is nice but plagiarism is a whole lot quicker. Usually plagiarism is not a good thing, but in this particular case I want to talk about a project in Montana that is worthy of copying in all the other 49 States.

Some of you computer nerds might recognize the name Siebel. Tom Siebel sold his business to Oracle, so he is out of that business. He set up a 501(c)(3) called The Meth Project in Montana. The Montana Meth Project is the first affiliate.

We are spending currently about \$10 million just on methamphetamine use alone, trying to get a targeted message to 12- to 17-year-olds. Our children are using meth. We need to get to it.

It is a fabulous program. We do not need to recreate the wheel. What we do need to do is allow the director the opportunity to have the flexibility to grant monies from this program to other entities to prove that there are other advertising strategies out there.

When you go to the doctor with an illness, usually you go to a family practitioner; but when you finally find out what is wrong, you will probably go to a specialist. Methamphetamine is a cancer. We can carve out surgically the problem if we identify it. We use a rifle-shot approach if we follow a model similar to what is happening in Montana. Let me use the numbers. Within the last 6 months we have had 30,000 minutes of television, 30,000 minutes of radio advertising, print, billboards, Internet ads. We are reaching each teen in Montana, on average, 3 times a day. It is phenomenal and we are seeing the numbers drop.

These are the kinds of exciting programs that, once you make the determination that not all good ideas originate in Washington, D.C., there are ideas throughout the Nation, the rest of the country will be jealous. They will want the opportunity to copy what we have got going on in Montana.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I think we have a situation where I have been a big proponent of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, but I think we have to be very careful in how we spend our money.

There are parts of our country that are suffering tremendously with regard to methamphetamine. And I do not think it is unreasonable to take that 10 percent and make sure it is directed towards that problem. The fact still remains, and one of the things that I do like about this amendment is that if there is a decrease in the methamphetamine labs, then that money is then put back to be used for other purposes. I think that makes sense. Perhaps we ought to do that more in other legislation that we pass out of this House.

I support the gentleman. Our subcommittee has been very, very concerned about methamphetamines. This is just another way that perhaps we can prevent some of our young people from going that route.

During much of the testimony by the way that we received, there was a lot of testimony with regard to young people now looking more and more at ads, by the way, on the Internet. And I think that just as we have to adjust when we find that certain drugs become the drug of the day or the drug of the year, we have to adjust our methodology, too, and the amount of money that we are spending with regard to, like I say, a program like this for addressing methamphetamines.

I support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 5 additional minutes, given the numbers of speakers that we have on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) for working with me on this issue.

Meth abuse is prevalent in all the States and imposes a high cost on soci-

ety, Mr. Chairman. Meth is highly addictive and its effects are severe and longlasting. Recent studies have demonstrated meth causes more damage to the brain than heroine, alcohol, or cocaine. Its abuse impacts not only the users but also the user's family and the general public. Thousands of children across the country have been taken away from their meth-abusing parents, placed with relatives, or shifted into the already overcrowded foster care system.

It is our duty in Congress to ensure that the public is informed and educated about the dangerous effects of this drug, and that is why I helped introduce this amendment.

This amendment is an important tool to fight the meth epidemic. It will require that at least 10 percent of the media budget for the Office of National Drug Control Policy be spent on advertising fighting meth abuse. With this minimum percentage we can ensure that the public is educated about the dangers and risks of this deadly drug and help prevent its further abuse.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I want to compliment Mr. REHBERG and the group of cosponsors who have all been active in the anti-meth efforts. Montana has been truly a model of what the private sector can do.

The campaign that Mr. REHBERG was talking about is so much more dramatic than what we have seen out of the Federal Government. It is extremely disappointing that we need to look at how to use this Montana model in how to get our national ad campaign engaged.

As has been pointed out, there are some risks when you designate a percentage of the national media campaign to be devoted to one particular drug. But this says if there is a reduction and there is a proven reduction, then that requirement will not be there. Plus, if the Congress of Counties in the United States say this is the number one drug problem in America, if we are hearing about it in basically in all 50 States now, but 37 States have heard about it so aggressively that they are banning pseudoephedrine or moving to ban pseudoephedrine. And we just passed a bill in the United States Congress to in effect reduce cold medicines from 120 choices down to 20 because of the ravages of meth, if we are willing to take those drastic strategies; if the county officials across the country say meth is the number one epidemic; if local law enforcement is telling us that in big cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul or Omaha or Portland that the bulk of their people that are in jail, kids in child custody, are because of meth; if small rural towns in the Midwest and the West are hard hit by meth, California has these super labs that are there; if we are seeing it move into Pennsylvania and

North Carolina and down into Florida, and now getting into New England; if this is that big of a problem, is this so outrageous to ask that 10 percent of the national ad campaign be devoted to fighting meth?

□ 1430

Where have they been? I thank the gentleman who brought this amendment forward and strongly support the amendment.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), one of the sponsors.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. REHBERG, and we have really enjoyed working on this. I rise also in strong support. The only reservation I have at all is perhaps 10 percent is not enough. We are dealing with a situation that in Arkansas, started in the Midwest, started in Arkansas, States like that, very rapidly spread across the country.

When I talk to anybody in enforcement in my State, they tell us that 65 to 70 percent of crime in Arkansas now is directly attributed to methamphetamine. Our shelters are full. When you use this drug for an extended period of time you tend to get paranoid. You start beating up your family, and it is at an age when the children are invariably involved because it is in your 20s to 40s.

While I was waiting to come and speak on this, I went in and talked to my MediVac folks who are out there that wanted to tell me about their issues in transporting patients. I mentioned I was going to come here and speak on this bill. They started relating story after story of transporting burn patients, children, men and women that had been injured as they were cooking meth that exploded.

So, again, I appreciate the chairman and ranking member and strongly support the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the time.

I want to add that I, too, believe it should be more than 10 percent. Of course, the ONDCP director has that flexibility.

I would also like to additionally comment a little bit more on the statement of administration policy and the bill in general that shows our frustration.

I mentioned in the State Department on the certification process that the State Department has certification, but there are many other variables. In fact, that clause has been weakened to say "demonstrably failing." What this says is the drug czar has to show whether these nations, such as Mexico, whether the pseudoephedrine producers such as India and China are fully cooperating, because we need to have the drug czar say what is happening on

narcotics, and the State Department can make their own rulings.

Furthermore, we have a big debate about how the budget should be counted. We believe that the administration has been misrepresenting what we are actually spending on narcotics in multiple ways. For example, in prisons, they count treatment as the only part of the prisons that is counted in the drug control budget. Well, we know many people are in jail because of narcotics. It leads to us not understanding what the actual costs of what we are doing are.

Now, I support all that. I am not trying to say it should be cut, but understating it does not give Congress an accurate impression of what we are spending on narcotics. Similarly, in the Department of Homeland Security.

So we are pushing in this legislation to address a wide range of things, and this particular amendment addresses one of the most egregious problems we have had, which anybody who has been watching this full debate sees, one amendment after another coming up on meth. That is because the people are speaking out. It is not just in the rural Midwest.

It started out in Hawaii, in Honolulu, had to fumigate certain apartments because you can endanger the children and the people moving in the next time. When we did a hearing in Congressman TURNER's district in Wilmington, Ohio, that very day in Dayton, Ohio, which is a large city, they found a string of seven houses that had the drug labs internally because you can smell it. That is partly why people go to rural areas, but they found the first big bust in Dayton because they brought up a string of houses so they could not smell it, much like they do with hydroponic marijuana. This is a thing with not only the crystal meth but even the drug labs are hitting the big cities. This is something that needs to be tackled.

This is one where we can win. This is one when you show the ads, like are shown in Montana, they capture the people. They understand the danger of this drug, and what we need to do is make sure our national ad campaign includes that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say this: I think that Mr. SOUDER makes a very good point. One of the things that I think we probably need to see, and particularly our young folk, is the devastation of meth and to see what it causes people to do to themselves and the effect that it has had on communities. I am convinced that if our young people just had any idea of what happens to people when they use meth, I think some of them would turn around.

During one of our hearings, we were shown numerous pictures of young people. One picture was taken before they used meth and then another taken even sometimes two or three months later,

and the difference was incredible. Many of them looked like they had aged about 10 years in about three or four, five months. Many of them looked very drawn and, I mean, just had all kinds of blisters and marks on their faces and their bodies. If there is one thing that we have learned about certain actions of young people, many of them want to continue to look good. We discovered that when we dealt with the whole issue of steroids.

So I think it is important. We have not seen the kind of reduction that we would like to see in methamphetamine use. As a matter of fact, it is pretty stable, but we would like to see it go down, and I think that this is the appropriate approach.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) who has played a very, very important role in the whole meth issue, and I thank him for helping to cosponsor this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. REHBERG for leading on this amendment and giving me an opportunity to participate in this.

I would like to also thank the Chairman, Mr. SOUDER, for the intensive work that he has done on meth. It has been a real catalyst for all of us that have joined together on this team.

This amendment would dedicate a minimum of 10 percent of the funds to the anti-meth ad campaign to win the war on meth. Meth destroys our rural communities from the inside out. We need to make sure that people, especially our young people, get the message: meth kills.

In Iowa, we are turning the tide in the war on meth with an 80 percent reduction in the number of meth labs after passing a tough precursor law. Unfortunately, meth continues to pour in from our southern border, primarily Mexico. The dedicated dollars in this amendment will help stop young people, especially, from using meth in the first place.

Meth is more than 10 percent of the illegal drug problem in America. Spending 10 percent on this ad campaign is the minimum that we should commit.

I thank you.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank everybody, everybody who has talked on the issue today, everybody who has been involved on this amendment and the bill as well. Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SOUDER, your leadership on the whole drug issue has been very important to this country.

We are lucky in Montana. We have 930,000 people. We have 147,000 square miles, and we decided to make ourselves the pilot project to see if it could work, if we could have a massive

campaign run like pretty much a political campaign. We have polling. We have focus groups. We have monitoring to see if our advertising is effective. We have both Senators, Senator BAUCUS, Senator BURNS and myself, Governor Schweitzer.

We have the State legislature, law enforcement, district courts, Supreme Court, the judges and the U.S. Marshal all involved in this issue. It is the most phenomenal program I have ever seen, and I want to welcome you to the program, and I would like to share with you, as well, if you are interested in seeing the ads, if you would like a presentation, it is the kind of program that will make a government program that is already funded here in Washington even better.

We are not trying to replace it. All we are trying to do is present the idea to the drug czar, to the administration, to the director and say if you are interested in something like this, you ought to have the ability to either grant to an organization like this or this organization. It is a 501(c)(3), so it is a not-for-profit, but it is a great idea. So what we want to do is provide the flexibility.

Forty-four percent of teens believe meth helps you lose weight. Thirty-nine percent of teens believe that meth makes you feel happy. Thirty-five percent of teens believe meth gives you more energy. Twenty-three percent of teens have close friends who use meth. It scares me to death. I have a teenage daughter. I have one coming up shortly behind. Our children will tell you they are confronted by this problem every day at school. We did not have the fear that they do of going to school and being confronted with something that you use it once and it is proven it stays in your brain for many, many years, a drug that makes you want to pull your hair out, pick your skin off. You start bleeding. You lose your teeth.

This is the kind of thing we cannot allow in our country. There are a lot of issues we deal with on a daily basis in Congress. Sometimes we name post offices. Other days we deal with issues like September 11, and on a scale of 1 to 10 this is an 11. When it comes to issues that this country needs to deal with and this Congress needs to address, this methamphetamine use and drug use within our general population, especially among some of our most vulnerable, which are our teens, 13 to 17 or 12 to 17, we have got a program we would like to share with you as a pilot project.

There are many ideas out there coming up from all over the country, and what my amendment does is give the director the flexibility to try some new and creative things and require at least a simple 10 percent of the money for advertising be spent on methamphetamine.

Again, they have come in this year for a budget request of about \$120 million. So this means at least \$12 million would be spent. We are spending that

much almost this year in Montana. So 10 percent is not enough.

Let me point out and thank at this time the other major players in this whole arena: television stations, radio stations, newspapers, the Internet. They are all voluntarily matching dollar for dollar every dollar that is being put in the Montana meth project. This is a tremendous volunteer organization and a tremendous advertising program. I think you will like it if you see it.

Again, I hope you will support the amendment; and to all my colleagues that spoke today, that worked on this amendment, thank you for giving us the consideration that you have. Please favorably look at this amendment and vote "yes."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time. The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. RENZI

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. RENZI:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. REPORT ON TRIBAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN HIDTA PROCESS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIREMENT.**—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report for Congress on the representation of tribal governments in the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program and in high intensity drug trafficking areas designated under that Program. The report shall include—

(1) a list of the tribal governments represented in the Program and a description of the participation by such governments in the Program;

(2) an explanation of the rationale for the level of representation by such governments; and

(3) recommendations by the Director for methods for increasing the number of tribal governments represented in the Program.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The report prepared under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program" means the program established under section 707 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1706)

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am fortunate to represent more Native Americans than any other district in Congress, and this amendment addresses the needs for the tribes and the Office of National Drug Control Policy to work together to combat drug trafficking throughout Indian Country.

The purpose of HIDTA is to enhance and coordinate drug control efforts among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies; and the HIDTA has proved to be an effective tool, and yet tribal governments need to play a greater role.

Our amendment will do just that. It requires a report from the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy on the representation of tribal governments in the HIDTA process. The report would detail a list of tribal governments represented. It would explain the rationale for the level of tribal inclusion and would ask for recommendations to increase the number of tribal governments participating in the program.

I represent the Navajo Nation, the White Mountain Apaches, the San Carlos Apaches, the Yavapai Apaches. Their reservations alone are roughly the same size as the States of Maryland, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Vermont all combined.

□ 1445

These large land masses provide an ideal safe haven for drug smugglers, felons on the run, and these drug dealers. The reservations consist of vast rural areas, with little or no law enforcement to help provide protection. In addition, there is an abundance of tribal youth who in the eyes of these drug dealers serve as perfect innocent drug users.

In recent years, the choice of drugs on these reservations and throughout my district has been methamphetamines. It has destroyed the rule of law among the reservation people. It is killing our tribal youth in this country. More than 90 percent of the meth that comes into Arizona comes in through Mexico, and yet we have superlabs on the reservation that produce some of the purest form of highly addictive blend of toxics that make up methamphetamine. And the meth that is produced in these superlabs on the reservation sells for cheaper value on the street than the meth that is produced off the reservation.

My colleagues, I have to thank Chairman SOUDER. He has been out to northern Arizona. He is a champion of those among Indian country, particularly on this issue as it relates to helping so many of our youth combat the drug issue. I commend his efforts and I would ask my colleagues to help us with the most impoverished of our Nation and help our tribal youth say no

to methamphetamine and be included in the HIDTA process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and, as I said, I do not oppose this amendment. It is an excellent amendment.

We have known for a long time that drug and alcohol abuse has been particularly devastating where there is lack of job opportunities on many of the reservations of our Indian nations in America, and it has been historic in fetal alcohol syndrome and other challenges.

What is astounding to me is that the administration's Attorney General Gonzalez recently made the statement that meth is an epidemic, but the office that is supposed to control all this, the drug czar's office, continues to downplay meth and has actually said that it is not growing. Yet on the ground, none of us are hearing this.

For example, in the Indian nations, where it is relatively quiet in the sense of the national knowledge of what Mr. Just described, at a hearing in Minnesota, the U.S. Attorney was there. He is the lead for the northern tribes in Montana, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and so on, and he said that meth is tearing through the Indian nations in a way they haven't seen in other narcotics; at reservation in the southern part of Arizona, which is right on the border, and there they are right on the front lines of all kinds of narcotics as well, as the crystal meth that is going to come across.

This meth is going to move into upstate New York, where we have the reservation, the historic Mohawk reservation up on the Saint Lawrence Seaway, which once again is at a critical border point. And as we watch meth tearing through these Indian nations, we need to make sure when we put together these High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas that are under this, that those tribal nations are included as representatives.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona taking the lead and making sure that as we have in these urban areas, whether it be in Arizona, whether it be in Minnesota, whether it be the Rocky Mountain HIDTA, or whether it be the northern upstate New York and other areas where we have major Indian nations, that they are included as we try to tackle drug trafficking and as we particularly get at the new scourge of methamphetamines.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time, and I take this moment to support the amendment. I think it is a very good amendment.

Our dealings in the subcommittee with HIDTA is that HIDTA allows for all of our law enforcement agencies to come together to address the issue of drugs. And certainly where there is a problem, we want to make sure that law enforcement is there.

I have often said that we cannot deal with drugs just from a law enforcement standpoint, but we have to couple that with effective treatment and try to prevent folks from even going on drugs. But the fact is I think it is a good amendment and it makes our bill a better one.

I think that what the gentleman has done through the amendment has brought something to the attention of the committee and certainly sort of shined a little light on so that perhaps we can more effectively deal with those problems in those tribal areas.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I want to again compliment the gentleman from Arizona. The Navajo nation is in northern Arizona and spills over into New Mexico and is a huge dominant entity, and he has worked aggressively to defend their interests and to make sure they are included in efforts like this, where sometimes they are forgotten.

Oklahoma, which has been ravaged by narcotics, and as we see it go into the mountains of North Carolina, clearly the Cherokee nation and other nations are at risk with this, too. The gentleman's amendment will help in many of these areas as we try to tackle meth and other narcotics.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his kind words and his bipartisanship on this issue. It truly is bigger than any one party.

Also, I want to again thank the chairman for coming out to Arizona and seeing it firsthand, and I will end with this message: What alcohol did to our Native Americans in the late 1800s is now what is occurring with the methamphetamine pandemic across Indian country in our Nation.

These gentlemen and their committees stand in the gap to stop that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time on behalf of Mr. TERRY to offer his amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 143, after line 11, insert the following:

(1) Section 704(c)(2) is amended by inserting "and the head of each major national organization that represents law enforcement officers, agencies, or associations" after "agency".

Page 143, line 12, strike "Section 704(c)(2)" and insert the following:

(2) Section 704(c)(2).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman LEE TERRY brought this amendment to the Rules Committee, and I strongly support this amendment. One of the things I should point out is that this has been an unusual day. We have been asking for some time to be able to have a meth day. Clearly, this has turned into a meth day, as well as when we did the terrorism bill. We had methamphetamines as part of that. And the reason is because we are hearing from the grass roots and they want to tackle the methamphetamine issue.

Earlier today, interestingly, we had the Meth Caucus and others who were not able to come to the floor because there was a major press conference with DEA and other agencies to talk about the bill that we passed earlier this week, the largest methamphetamine act in the United States' history as part of the terrorism bill. And Mr. TERRY and other Members, including Coach OSBORNE and others who come to the floor regularly on meth, are over at the White House for the signing ceremony on the methamphetamine bill. So I have been here on the floor today, and some Members have been able to make it over, but this has been a meth day and beyond on the House floor, and it is meth day at the White House as well as throughout Capitol Hill.

This particular amendment directs the director of ONDCP, the "drug czar" to consult with the head of each major national organization that represents law enforcement officers, agencies, or associations. That would include, for example, Ron Brooks of the National Narcotics Officers Associations Coalition, the Fraternal Order of Police, the national HIDTA directors. He must consult them prior to making recommendations to the President on national budget for drug control enforcement each year.

So why would we need this kind of amendment in this bill? I would think that this is what the director does for a living. But when we had a hearing and asked why the HIDTAs were being moved to the Justice Department at this hearing, we had the director of the narcotics officers who said they hadn't been consulted. We had the director of the Chicago HIDTA, the Speaker's HIDTA, and he said he hadn't been consulted. We had the directors of the Southwest border HIDTA, and they

said they had not been consulted. We had the director of the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA, and he said he had not been consulted. We had the director of the Missouri HIDTA, the sheriff of our Whip ROY BLUNT's home area, and he said he had never been consulted.

The question is: Who did they consult? If they didn't consult the HIDTA directors, any of them, if they didn't consult the narcotics officers, if they didn't consult the police officers, on what grounds are they making recommendations to in effect gut these programs and move them to other departments? On what grounds are they proposing to wipe out the Byrne grants and the drug czar be silent or actually supportive? On what grounds are they proposing to wipe out the meth hot spots?

I think it would be just basic good procedure that the director would talk to these groups before he would make these recommendations. Yet all these groups say he has never had a meeting with them. He is not meeting with them before he makes these recommendations. I think, quite frankly, it is a sad day when the United States Congress has to put into a bill that the director meets with the people who are on the street fighting the drug war, which he should be doing as part of his job.

But I strongly commend Mr. TERRY for this amendment, because we need the director. If we are going to have a director, a drug czar who is going to make recommendations that impact State and local law enforcement all over the country, that impact our HDTAs all over the country, we ought to at least know, and he can still make whatever recommendations he wants, and the President can still make whatever recommendations he wants, but we would like to know before that recommendation comes over that he has at least talked to the people doing the job at the grassroots level.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do support this amendment.

Let me go back for a minute, though. I agree with Mr. SOUDER in that I think it is unfortunate that we have to come to the floor of the House to ask ONDCP to consult with law enforcement. There is a thin blue line. We have our officers come in and ask us for all kinds of things in our subcommittee. And I always say that these are the people who are on the front lines. They are the ones who so often have to burst into houses when they do not know what is

behind that door. They are the ones who leave home so often in the morning not knowing whether they are going to return to their families. They are the ones, for example in HIDTA, who sit down with the locals and the State folk and the Federal folk and come up with all kinds of strategies. They know what they need to do the job.

I have often heard the President say that when it comes to the war in Iraq, he wants to make sure he gets advice from the people that are on the ground. These are the folk that are on the ground.

But if I had my say about this amendment, I would expand it not only to our law enforcement folk but also to those people who day after day work, for example, in the drug-free communities effort, citizens who are working hard every day sacrificing their time and their resources to make their communities better. Hopefully, this will send a message, a very strong message to the drug czar.

What has happened is we have found ourselves, and I can understand our committee's frustration, because we get policies coming down from the White House which seem contrary to the very things that the people who are on the ground say that they need and the way they would like to see us proceed. Then we have to then change the White House policy so as to fit what is the reality on the ground. There just has to be a better way.

Again, one of the things we are concerned about, and I have said it many times, I think Republicans and Democrats can agree on one major thing, and that is that we want the people's tax dollars to be spent effectively and efficiently. And when the HIDTA folks came in and said to us, person after person, HIDTA after HIDTA, that they could not understand why it was that they were being shifted to the Justice Department and part of their budget was being taken away, I never got the impression for one second that it was just about a turf war or it was about just being petty in any way.

□ 1500

But I got the impression because they deal with this every day, they wanted to make sure that they had the tools and had the atmosphere and what they do, they could most effectively and efficiently do their job.

So like I said, it is unfortunate that we have to come to this point to basically mandate that consultation take place. But so often in our society we have a tendency to talk about each other and not talk to each other. I think perhaps, just perhaps by forcing folks to come together and at least talk, we will be able to address these problems more effectively so we do not have to go through this process over and over and over again.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 5 additional minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think Mr. CUMMINGS' point is a fitting conclusion as we move to the end of this debate. Our frustration is that since there has not been an authorization, the director of ONDCP has proposed a number of changes which would greatly undermine what this Congress intended.

When we set up the High Intensity Drug Trafficking programs, the HIDTA, it was meant initially to focus on the Southwest border, which has not been particularly effective. In case anybody noticed, we do not have great control there, partly because we do not have an integrated Southwest border strategy. We have starts, we have a Southwest border HIDTA, but we need a Southwest border strategy.

In these High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, we move to the biggest cities and say, this is how the drugs come in and move into Indiana from Chicago and Detroit. You need the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA and the Los Angeles HIDTA, the Phoenix and the Houston HDTAs behind the border.

Other States then saw the effectiveness. What made HIDTA effective? The idea was if the Federal Government tried to do everything through DEA, FBI, Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Customs, it would not work. Sometimes even our Federal agents were arresting each other, and we were not getting integrated with State and local law enforcement.

So the goal in HIDTA was if we put a 1 million, \$2 million into an area, first off, we would require all of the Federal agents to be there and they would get half the votes, and then we would get the States and locals and they would get half the votes, and they would feel actual ownership of it. If they felt ownership, they would participate.

As the head of the Phoenix Police Department told us at a hearing, it was moved over to ODETF. It has done wonderful work, but ODETF talks to supposedly State and local law enforcement, but State and local law enforcement do not get a vote. So they get put on a board, and they come to a meeting once in a while. HIDTA actually gives them a vote. The head of the Phoenix Police Department said his city council asks him on a regular basis, can you justify this, can you justify that. He has kept three officers in the HIDTA because he sees how that HIDTA money gets leveraged with the State police, with the U.S. Attorney's Office, with the U.S. Marshals, with the FBI, DEA, and with everybody else.

Why, when we finally get a program that works at the State and local levels that leverages these dollars, would we gut it without even talking to the people involved? The Phoenix police chairman said he would pull his three officers out of the narcotics effort if it

was moved. So did Chicago. So did city after city. And it is so exasperating that they continue to persist on this. But it shows it has done a great job of educating the HIDTAs.

The New York City HIDTA is integrated completely with terrorism, and it is an amazing operation as we see those to links occur. The national ad campaign we are addressing throughout this bill because we think it has been effective and we need to make it more effective, and it needs to include meth.

The administration was also proposing dramatic changes to the technology center. It is one of the most valuable things to State and local law enforcement because not only do we give them goods, but it is a model for what we are trying to do on homeland security, that is, when a police department says I would like this kind of radio, night goggle, protective gear, they analyze it. In my district, take Albion, 1,500, Kendallville is 10,000 people, Fort Wayne is 230,000 people. They can go through their list and say we would like these goggles, but then it goes through a review process and they say this is probably not what you need in Albion. Unless you can make a defense, you don't get that. You have to submit what kind of drug challenges you have, what types of things you need, and the Technology Assessment Center then, off of your list, you match up what your departments need.

Everybody in homeland security gets this pool of money, and now they have all kinds of things that they may not ever need and mismatches. Now we are trying to have the State say, what is your homeland security plan; to have the locals say, what is your homeland security plan. Then in a technology center, we should have it work like in the drug czar's office, except the drug czar wants to get rid of his own Department.

It is baffling why there is this persistent goal in the administration to wipe out the things that most benefit State and local and keep the parts that are nationally under their control.

So I think this bill will comprehensively address a whole series of those concerns. I am pleased that we have been able to do this. The Meth Caucus has been bipartisan; this subcommittee has been bipartisan with Mr. CUMMINGS and the full active membership of subcommittee. We have all been able to bring a bill forth and move through the full committee unanimously. Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Education, and Intelligence committees all participated in this process, individual Members with their amendments as well as the Meth Caucus.

I hope this bill will receive unanimous support. Three of the amendments we need a "yes" on. There is one amendment that would get rid of ONDCP, and I urge a "no" vote on that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to this amendment for just a second. When I think about the entire process here and our subcommittee, we realized that there are experts in the area of narcotics, and we bring them before us all the time to seek their advice. In seeking their advice, we learn a lot. One of the things that we also realize is that this world of drugs is ever-changing from day to day, from hour to hour.

We also realized, as we moved throughout the country, that there are various law enforcement methods that may be effective against one drug versus another.

I think we have a situation here when we talk about the drug czar consulting with, and that is ONDCP consulting with law enforcement, there is a certain level of respect that many of these officers have said that they simply desire, respect for what they do every day.

I think a lot of times when they come to us and they come shaking their heads, one of the things that I know our subcommittee worries about is their morale when they are out there putting their lives on the line. And I have talked to these officers. I know Mr. SOUDER has. They will say to us, we are doing the best we can with what we have got. They say in most instances, we do not have enough; but if you are going to take away some of the tools that we do have, it is going to become even more difficult for us to do our job.

Basically, what they are asking for is simply to be consulted, somebody to sit down and say, How is it going in Idaho or Baltimore, or, How is it going in California? And we have learned so much from these HIDTAs because they have an opportunity to work on all levels of government. So they can bring things I would think to the drug czar's office that the drug czar may not be aware of.

That is why I am so supportive of this amendment; but I have to say, I do feel it is very unfortunate that we have to go through this process. I would hope that perhaps by doing this it will open those doors of communication so that these great men and women who courageously put their lives on the line and who have taken a phenomenal amount of time and energy to learn law enforcement, to understand it, to understand how the drug trade works, to understand the methods of combating folks who want to violate our drug laws, that we would have the benefit, that the drug czar would have the benefit of their knowledge and expertise so when we have legislation, we can have it from the very, very best.

I must tell you that I do believe that we have some of the best law enforcement in the entire country. But again as I have said to Mr. SOUDER, I wish that it went beyond just law enforcement, because I think if we are going to address the whole issue of drugs in consultation with the drug czar, it must also be with all of those people

who are out there dealing in the area of prevention, dealing in the area of interdiction, addressing our children, dealing with methamphetamines and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given an additional 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana and probably the leader in Congress in helping fight our war against drugs in our communities across this Nation.

I stand with my colleagues here in discussing a problem in our towns and our neighborhoods, particularly in Nebraska, and it is methamphetamines. Also, our teenagers are experimenting with prescription drugs where they can get a hold of them.

It is our police officers and our sheriffs and then our State patrol that are on the front lines. It was they 2 years ago who were telling me that some of the gangs in Omaha that had cocaine or marijuana were changing their product of distribution away from those drugs to crystal meth made in Mexico.

Mr. SOUDER held a hearing with Mr. Walters a year ago, who was really, I am not exaggerating here, flabbergasted that some of the grant monies that the administration had zeroed out was actually being used for task forces against methamphetamines and these gangs, and yet my police department knew about it 2 years ago.

I know that this amendment that I have drafted sounds almost nonsensical in its common sense. Why would the national director of our drug policy not be communicating with local police officers who are our front line in this battle? But the reality is they have detached themselves and are advancing a policy to move all of this over to the Justice Department where there will be even less communication with those on the ground that know exactly what is occurring in our communities and what then we must do on the national level to make sure that we arm them correctly to protect our families from these international drug lords.

This is a commonsense amendment that I would encourage all of my colleagues to support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PAUL of Texas.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. REHBERG of Montana.

□ 1515

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—403

Abercrombie	Camp (MI)	Dreier
Ackerman	Campbell (CA)	Duncan
Aderholt	Cannon	Edwards
Akin	Capito	Ehlers
Alexander	Capps	Emanuel
Allen	Capuano	Emerson
Andrews	Cardin	Engel
Baca	Cardoza	English (PA)
Baird	Carnahan	Eshoo
Baker	Carson	Etheridge
Baldwin	Carter	Everett
Barrett (SC)	Case	Farr
Barrow	Castle	Fattah
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Feeney
Barton (TX)	Chandler	Ferguson
Bass	Chocola	Fiener
Bean	Clay	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Beauprez	Cleaver	Foley
Becerra	Clyburn	Forbes
Berkley	Coble	Fortenberry
Berman	Cole (OK)	Fossella
Berry	Conaway	Fox
Biggert	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Bilirakis	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY)	Cramer	Gallely
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Garrett (NJ)
Blackburn	Crowley	Gerlach
Blumenauer	Cubin	Gibbons
Blunt	Cuellar	Gilchrest
Boehlert	Culberson	Gillmor
Boehner	Cummings	Gohmert
Bonilla	Davis (AL)	Goode
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Goodlatte
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Granger
Boren	Davis (TN)	Graves
Boswell	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Boucher	Davis, Tom	Green, Al
Boustany	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Boyd	DeGette	Grijalva
Bradley (NH)	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Hall
Brown (OH)	Dent	Harman
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harris
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hart
Brown-Waite,	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Ginny	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Doggett	Hayes
Butterfield	Doolittle	Hayworth
Buyer	Doyle	Hefley
Calvert	Drake	Hensarling

Herger	McGovern
Herseht	McHenry
Higgins	McHugh
Hinchee	McIntyre
Hinojosa	McKeon
Hobson	McKinney
Hoekstra	McMorris
Holden	McNulty
Holt	Meehan
Hooley	Meek (FL)
Hostettler	Meeks (NY)
Hoyer	Melancon
Hulshof	Mica
Hunter	Michaud
Hyde	Millender-
Inglis (SC)	McDonald
Inslee	Miller (FL)
Israel	Miller (MI)
Issa	Miller (NC)
Istook	Miller, Gary
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan
(TX)	Moore (KS)
Jefferson	Moore (WI)
Jindal	Moran (KS)
Johnson (CT)	Moran (VA)
Johnson (IL)	Murphy
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha
Johnson, Sam	Musgrave
Jones (NC)	Myrick
Jones (OH)	Nadler
Kanjorski	Napolitano
Kaptur	Neal (MA)
Keller	Neugebauer
Kelly	Ney
Kennedy (MN)	Northup
Kennedy (RI)	Nunes
Kildee	Nussle
Kilpatrick (MI)	Oberstar
Kind	Obey
King (IA)	Oliver
King (NY)	Ortiz
Kingston	Osborne
Kirk	Otter
Kline	Owens
Knollenberg	Pascarell
Kolbe	Pastor
Kucinich	Payne
Kuhl (NY)	Pearce
LaHood	Pence
Langevin	Peterson (MN)
Lantos	Petri
Larsen (WA)	Pickering
Larson (CT)	Pitts
Latham	Platts
LaTourette	Poe
Leach	Pombo
Lee	Pomeroy
Levin	Porter
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)
Lewis (KY)	Putnam
Lipinski	Radanovich
LoBiondo	Rahall
Lofgren, Zoe	Ramstad
Lowe	Rangel
Lucas	Regula
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg
E.	Reichert
Lynch	Renzi
Mack	Reyes
Maloney	Rogers (AL)
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)
Marchant	Rogers (MI)
Markey	Rohrabacher
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen
Matheson	Ross
Matsui	Rothman
McCarthy	Roybal-Allard
McCaul (TX)	Ruppersberger
McCollum (MN)	Rush
McCotter	Ryan (OH)
McCrery	Ryan (WI)
McDermott	Ryun (KS)

NOES—2

Paul
NOT VOTING—27

Bachus	Gonzalez	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Honda	Reynolds
Cantor	Jenkins	Royce
Costa	Linder	Salazar
Davis (FL)	Norwood	Sanchez, Loretta
Deal (GA)	Oxley	Shays
Evans	Pallone	Sweeney
Ford	Pelosi	Tancredo
Gingrey	Peterson (PA)	Westmoreland

Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1540

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—403

Abercrombie	Carter	Fortenberry
Ackerman	Case	Fossella
Aderholt	Castle	Fox
Akin	Chabot	Frank (MA)
Alexander	Chandler	Franks (AZ)
Allen	Chocola	Frelinghuysen
Andrews	Clay	Gallely
Baca	Cleaver	Garrett (NJ)
Baird	Clyburn	Gerlach
Baker	Coble	Gibbons
Baldwin	Cole (OK)	Gilchrest
Barrett (SC)	Conaway	Gillmor
Barrow	Conyers	Gohmert
Bartlett (MD)	Cooper	Goode
Barton (TX)	Costello	Goodlatte
Bass	Cramer	Gordon
Bean	Crenshaw	Granger
Beauprez	Crowley	Graves
Becerra	Cubin	Green (WI)
Berkley	Cuellar	Green, Al
Berman	Culberson	Green, Gene
Berry	Cummings	Grijalva
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Gutknecht
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Hall
Bishop (NY)	Davis (KY)	Harman
Bishop (UT)	Davis (TN)	Harris
Blackburn	Davis, Jo Ann	Hart
Blumenauer	Davis, Tom	Hastings (FL)
Blunt	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Boehlert	DeGette	Hayes
Boehner	Delahunt	Hayworth
Bonilla	DeLauro	Hefley
Bonner	DeLay	Hensarling
Bono	Dent	Herger
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herseth
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Higgins
Boswell	Dicks	Hinchee
Boucher	Dingell	Hinojosa
Boustany	Doggett	Hobson
Boyd	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bradley (NH)	Doyle	Holden
Brady (PA)	Drake	Holt
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Honda
Brown (OH)	Duncan	Hooley
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Hostettler
Brown, Corrine	Ehlers	Hoyer
Brown-Waite,	Emanuel	Hulshof
Ginny	Emerson	Hunter
Burgess	Engel	Hyde
Butterfield	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)
Buyer	Eshoo	Inslee
Calvert	Etheridge	Israel
Camp (MI)	Everett	Issa
Campbell (CA)	Farr	Istook
Cannon	Fattah	Jackson (IL)
Capito	Feeney	Jackson-Lee
Capps	Ferguson	(TX)
Capuano	Filner	Jefferson
Cardin	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Jindal
Cardoza	Foley	Johnson (CT)
Carnahan	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Carson		

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeltion
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Flake Paul Taylor (NC)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sodrel
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1548

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 85, noes 322, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—85

Abercrombie
Alexander
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Boustany
Boyd
Brown-Waite,
Turner
Ginny
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Capuano
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Delahunt
Doggett
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gohmert
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lee
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McGovern
McKinney
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Obey
Oliver
Otter
Paul
Payne
Poe
Pombo
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Slaughter
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tierney
Watson
Wilson (SC)

NOES—322

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Choccola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Choccola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar

Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hereth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas

Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross

Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeltion
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Bachus
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Dicks
Evans
Foley
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1556

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 36 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "No."

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 9, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—399

Abercrombie	Carnahan	Foley
Ackerman	Carson	Forbes
Aderholt	Carter	Portenberry
Akin	Case	Fossella
Alexander	Castle	Fox
Allen	Chabot	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Chandler	Franks (AZ)
Baca	Chocola	Frelinghuysen
Baird	Clay	Gallegly
Baker	Cleaver	Garrett (NJ)
Baldwin	Clyburn	Gerlach
Barrett (SC)	Coble	Gibbons
Barrow	Cole (OK)	Gilchrest
Bartlett (MD)	Conaway	Gillmor
Barton (TX)	Conyers	Gohmert
Bass	Cooper	Goode
Bean	Costello	Goodlatte
Beauprez	Cramer	Gordon
Becerra	Crenshaw	Granger
Berkley	Crowley	Graves
Berman	Cubin	Green (WI)
Berry	Cuellar	Green, Al
Biggart	Culberson	Green, Gene
Bilirakis	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Gutknecht
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Hall
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Harman
Blumenauer	Davis (TN)	Harris
Blunt	Davis, Jo Ann	Hart
Boehlert	Davis, Tom	Hastings (FL)
Boehner	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	DeGette	Hayes
Bonner	DeLauro	Hayworth
Bono	DeLay	Hefley
Boozman	Dent	Hensarling
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herseth
Boucher	Dicks	Higgins
Boustany	Dingell	Hinche
Boyd	Doggett	Hinojosa
Bradley (NH)	Doolittle	Hobson
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Drake	Holden
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Holt
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	Hooley
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Hostettler
Ginny	Emanuel	Hoyer
Burgess	Emerson	Hulshof
Butterfield	Engel	Hunter
Buyer	English (PA)	Hyde
Calvert	Eshoo	Inglis (SC)
Camp (MI)	Etheridge	Inslee
Campbell (CA)	Everett	Israel
Cannon	Farr	Issa
Capito	Fattah	Istook
Capps	Feeney	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Ferguson	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Filner	(TX)
Cardoza	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Jefferson

Jindal	Miller (FL)	Schakowsky
Johnson (CT)	Miller (MI)	Schiff
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Schwartz (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Schwartz (MI)
Jones (NC)	Mollohan	Scott (GA)
Jones (OH)	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Serrano
Kaptur	Murphy	Sessions
Keller	Murtha	Shadegg
Kelly	Musgrave	Shaw
Kennedy (MN)	Myrick	Sherman
Kildee	Nadler	Sherwood
Kilpatrick (MI)	Napolitano	Shimkus
Kind	Neal (MA)	Shuster
King (IA)	Neugebauer	Simmons
King (NY)	Ney	Simpson
Kingston	Northup	Skelton
Kirk	Nunes	Slaughter
Kline	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Knollenberg	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Obey	Smith (WA)
Kucinich	Oliver	Snyder
Kuhl (NY)	Ortiz	Sodrel
LaHood	Osborne	Solis
Langevin	Otter	Souder
Lantos	Owens	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Pascarella	Stark
Larson (CT)	Pastor	Stearns
Latham	Payne	Strickland
LaTourette	Pearce	Stupak
Leach	Pelosi	Sullivan
Lee	Pence	Tanner
Levin	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (KY)	Pitts	Terry
Lipinski	Platts	Thomas
LoBiondo	Poe	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pombo	Thompson (MS)
Lowey	Pomeroy	Thornberry
Lucas	Porter	Tiahrt
Lungren, Daniel	Price (NC)	Tiberi
E.	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lynch	Putnam	Towns
Mack	Radanovich	Turner
Maloney	Rahall	Udall (CO)
Manzullo	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
Marchant	Rangel	Upton
Marshall	Regula	Van Hollen
Matheson	Rehberg	Visclosky
Gillmor	Reichert	Walden (OR)
McCarthy	Renzi	Walsh
McCaul (TX)	Reyes	Wamp
McCollum (MN)	Reynolds	Wasserman
McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Schultz
McCrery	Rogers (KY)	Waters
McDermott	Rogers (MI)	Watson
McGovern	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
McHugh	Ross	Weldon (FL)
McIntyre	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McKinney	Royce	Wexler
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Whitfield
McNulty	Rush	Wicker
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (NM)
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Meeks (NY)	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
Melancon	Sabo	Woolsey
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Michaud	T.	Wynn
Millender-	Sanders	Young (AK)
McDonald	Saxton	Young (FL)

NOES—9

Delahunt	Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)
Flake	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Kennedy (RI)	Paul	Watt

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	Price (GA)
Cantor	Jenkins	Salazar
Costa	Linder	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (FL)	Markey	Shays
Deal (GA)	Norwood	Sweeney
Evans	Oxley	Tancred
Ford	Pallone	Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1604

Mr. DELAHUNT changed his vote from "aye" to "no".

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of the substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act, pursuant to House Resolution 713, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 5, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—399

Abercrombie	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,
Ackerman	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Aderholt	Blackburn	Burgess
Akin	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Alexander	Blunt	Buyer
Allen	Boehlert	Calvert
Andrews	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Baca	Bonilla	Campbell (CA)
Baird	Bonner	Cannon
Baker	Bono	Capito
Baldwin	Boozman	Capps
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Capuano
Barrow	Boswell	Cardin
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Carnahan
Bass	Boyd	Carson
Bean	Bradley (NH)	Carter
Beauprez	Brady (PA)	Case
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Castle
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Chabot
Berry	Brown (SC)	Chandler
Biggart	Brown, Corrine	Chocola
Bilirakis		Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hersteth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley

Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Ingalls (SC)
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markkey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy

Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Soderl
Souders
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—5

Frank (MA)
McDermott

Paul
Stark

Waters

NOT VOTING—28

Bachus
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Flake

Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)

Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Smith (WA)
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

□ 1622

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I was in Connecticut and, therefore, missed six recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on recorded vote No. 33, "aye" on recorded vote No. 34, "aye" on recorded vote No. 35, "no" on recorded vote 36, "aye" on recorded vote 37 and "aye" on recorded vote 38.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 34 through 38 earlier today, March 9, 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Chabot amendment—rollcall 34, "aye" on the Hooley amendment—rollcall 35, "no" on the Paul amendment—rollcall 36, "aye" on the Rehberg amendment—rollcall 37, and "aye" on final passage of H.R. 2829—rollcall 38.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the distinguished majority leader, for purposes of telling us what the schedule for the coming week is.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the

week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will take up consideration of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

Finally, we will consider H.R. 1606, the Online Freedom of Speech Act. The Committee on House Administration completed consideration of this bill this morning, and we expect that the Rules Committee will take this up next week to bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. From what you have said, it is my presumption then that the Online Freedom of Speech Act will be the last order of business?

Mr. BOEHNER. It will be considered, we believe, on Wednesday, possibly Thursday, but probably on Wednesday.

Mr. HOYER. And the emergency supplemental appropriation, you say Wednesday or Thursday?

Mr. BOEHNER. Wednesday, and possibly Thursday.

Mr. HOYER. So would that mean that we might consider the Internet bill prior to the supplemental? I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. That is a possibility.

Mr. HOYER. With respect, Mr. Leader, to the budget, I know there was some talk about doing it prior to our break, but you had indicated last week it might roll over. Do you have a guess?

Mr. BOEHNER. It appears that my guess last week was correct.

Mr. HOYER. Obviously. Can you tell us when you think the budget might come before the House? I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would hope that the House would complete its consideration of the budget in those 2 weeks that we are back after the March recess, sometime in that 2 weeks.

Mr. HOYER. So in the latter part of March or third or fourth week in March?

Mr. BOEHNER. And before April 8.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information that he has given to us.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2006 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2006, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HER EXCELLENCY ELLEN JOHNSON SIRLEAF, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 15, 2006, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Her Excellency Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, President of the Republic of Liberia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 715) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 715

Resolved, That the following Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Mr. Sodrel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Hon. TOM DELAY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, I hereby resign my position as a member of the House Office Building Commission effective immediately.

Sincerely,

TOM DELAY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2001, and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces that on February 13, 2006, the Speaker appointed the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) to the House Office Building Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

□ 1630

NEW MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM A SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter that was in today's St. Petersburg Times about the Medicare prescription drug plan. It was from a gentlewoman by the name of Lois Scheff of St. Petersburg, not in my district; but I think she echoes the comments that I have heard from my constituents. The letter says, "It would be nice to see a positive article about the Medicare part D prescription drug plan. I believe the reason so many people are having trouble with the new prescription drug plan is that the media has been telling everyone how confusing and difficult it is to understand. If you say something often enough, people will start to believe it."

She goes on to say, "My experience with the new prescription drug plan has been very positive. Upon filling four of my January prescriptions, I paid about 50 percent of what I normally would have, due to certain deductibles. In February, my four prescriptions cost me less than one would have before the drug plan went into effect. The other day I filled a prescription that used to cost more than \$100, and I paid 30 for it."

She goes on to say, "We might be elderly, but we are not stupid. Talk to the millions of us who have taken advantage of the program."

STUDY OF SECURITY AT OUR PORTS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just this past week I held a press conference at the port in Houston, Texas, the Houston Port Authority, discussing the overall issue of comprehensive security at the Nation's ports. I want to remind the administration that even if you are operating at the ports, you are also privy to security.

So I rise today to comment on the so-called brokered deal that suggests that we are now going to allow an American entity to operate the particular purchases that are being made by Dubai Ports. I started out this week by say-

ing this is not to stigmatize the Middle East or the Arab world, it is to question our confidence and commitment to security at our ports.

I question this deal. I would like to see how transparent it is. I want a complete transparency or a firewall between any foreign entity and the security of the Nation's ports. It is crucial that we do a study and assessment of how secure our ports are, and I will introduce legislation next week that calls for immediately an assessment of the Nation's ports and how secure they are.

YALE AND THE TALIBAN STUDENT

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a former deputy foreign secretary and ambassador at large for the rogue Taliban regime is now a "special student" at the elitist Yale University. According to Yale's officials, they are proud to have this Taliban student.

He legally entered our country on a student visa, of all things, issued by the State Department. That seems like nonsense to me. This offensive disregard for national security is not only ridiculous, it is frightening, and it has happened before. The hijackers who flew planes into the World Trade Center on 9/11, and who crashed into the Pentagon just down the street from us, entered the United States on, yes, student visas.

What is even more incomprehensible is that Yale University is helping to educate this Taliban operative, who just 5 years ago was touring the United States for the Taliban, spreading propaganda and defending the Taliban's gospel of hate.

Mr. Speaker, the Taliban is against everything freedom-loving people advocate. They advocate public torture, false imprisonment, mistreatment of women, and promotion of worldwide anarchy. Those are not accomplishments to be proud of.

Yale would do well to admit students who are devoted to promoting peace and democracy, not those who so flagrantly advocate injustice, evil, and terror.

That is just the way it is.

UAE TAKEOVER OF U.S. PORTS

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, so a back room deal has been cut for the UAE takeover of a number of U.S. ports. Now, just what does it mean? They do not say they are going to sell their interests. They say they are going to transfer their interests to a U.S. entity. So they are going to set up a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary in Delaware and claim that somehow this resolves the issue?

Besides that, the issue is bigger than the UAE takeover of the U.S. port facilities. It is about other foreign takeovers of our assets. The administration is still rushing ahead to allow foreign airlines to control U.S. airlines, and there are a host of other areas where our infrastructure is up for sale.

Congress still needs to act and put in place rules to bring about the wholesale sell-off of America and its security interests.

IRAQ WAR IS AGAINST TRADITIONAL CONSERVATIVE POSITION

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, William F. Buckley has often been described as the godfather of modern-day conservatism. In 2004, he wrote that if he had known in 2002 what he now knew, that he would have opposed the war in Iraq. Last June, he wrote that if we stayed much longer there, it would soon become misapplication of pride rather than steadfastness of purpose. Now, in one of his most recent columns, Mr. Buckley wrote that, "One can't doubt that the American objective in Iraq has failed."

Many conservatives said before this war started that it would mean massive foreign aid, huge deficit spending, and would place almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military, when traditionally conservatives have been the biggest critics of the U.N.

The so-called neo-con architects of this unnecessary war have led people down a primrose path in the opposite direction of and very much against every traditional conservative position.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PASSAGE OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFETY AND VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION ACT

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives passed the Child Safety and Violent Crime Reduction Act of 2005, and I am a strong supporter of the legislation. I hail its passage. But title VI of this legislation is drawn from a bill that I introduced in the first session of the 109th Congress.

My legislation is known as the Child Pornography Prevention Act of 2005. And as the title states, the intent of my legislation is to prevent American children from becoming victims of pornography. Every one of us knows that the fuel that fires the wicked hearts of child predators is child pornography and it must be confronted in America.

Every day in this country, children are sadly exploited in pornographic enterprises, sometimes by those closest to them, believe it or not, in their homes; sometimes by commercial producers. In the home, children are forced to pose for pornographic pictures or act in pornographic videos, sometimes by family members and even friends and caretakers and other trusted individuals. Sadly, our resources in the law enforcement community inform us that these pictures and videos are posted on the Internet or surreptitiously spread to sexual predators. In the commercial arena and in Hollywood, as our cultures become more and more youth oriented and sex has become more and more prevalent, we must ensure that children are not being used in the production of prurient material and provide law enforcement with the tools to prosecute those who exploit children.

A main tenet of my legislation is the language that will fix a technicality known as home pornographers, to get at the first problem that I just described. Home pornographers have used this loophole to evade Federal prosecution in child pornography cases. These individuals will use digital cameras, Polaroid cameras, video cameras to make pornographic images of children, download them and distribute them on the Internet. My legislation first and foremost makes it clear that Federal prosecutions of home pornographers may proceed in Federal Court because their activities impact on interstate commerce.

Another element of my bill, which has become in many ways more controversial, is the addition of a new section of the criminal code, section 2257A, which adds a recordkeeping requirement that will force people in even in the entertainment industry to keep records of the names and ages of their subjects, along with proof of their identification, when they are engaged even in simulated sexual activity on screen. Anytime Hollywood uses a simulated sex act in a soap opera, a cable television show, a movie, or other pro-

duction, a record must be kept to show that a child was not used even in the creation of a simulated sex act.

Heretofore, the law has only required that such records be kept in the cases of hard-core pornography, where actual sex was being performed and recorded for entertainment value. But if a child is used in a simulated sex act, the impact of such abuse on that child is, in many ways, Mr. Speaker, just as real as it would be had the production involved actual sexual contact. Therefore, my bill requires these records be kept for simulated sex. Because by doing so, certain bad actors in the entertainment industry will be deterred from using children.

Also, my bill goes a step further by requiring that records be kept even in the case of what is known as lascivious exhibition. Once again, no child should be used in either nude pictures or sexually explicit materials or even in activities that have a prurient interest. This is, again, the type of images that fuel the flames of the wicked hearts of child predators and should be stopped.

Finally, the legislation expands the ability of investigators and prosecutors to pursue the people who are used to distribute child pornography. These distributors also will be required to follow these new recordkeeping provisions, and this will provide law enforcement with a powerful tool against them as well.

Providing law enforcement with the tools to combat child pornography contained in my legislation is a much-needed and overdue step that must be taken to protect our children from those in society who have no decency and no shame.

I also commend those legitimate producers of entertainment products in the United States of America, with whom we have had dialogue and with whom we have worked in the development of this legislation. It is not my purpose in any way, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that those that are involved in the legitimate entertainment industry in this country have anything to do with the illegitimate industry that is pornography in America. Nevertheless, it is important that even in Main Street Hollywood America, that we ensure that children are not used even in the creation of entertainment materials that simulate sex acts, and our legislation will create the recordkeeping to prevent just that.

I hail the passage of the Child Pornography Prevention Act as a part of the Child Safety and Violent Crime Reduction Act. It is time to protect our kids, and yesterday this Congress took a great step toward that goal in entertainment in America.

THE FEDERAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Federal

debt. Now, President Bush was going to be a fiscal conservative and we were going to have smaller government. We actually have larger government. He has, in his 5 short years in office, in concert with the Republican Congress, raised the entire debt of the United States of America by 45 percent in 5 short years.

That is some accomplishment. That figures out to \$27,730 per person in the United States. But that is not enough because, actually, with a debt limit of about \$8.3 trillion, we bumped up against it yet again because of the profligate borrowing by this President and the Republican Congress. So Secretary Snow has requested a fourth increase in 5 years in the national debt limit by another \$781 million, which he says will tide us over for about a year.

Now, what is extraordinary is that right now the Government of the United States is teetering on the edge of default. In fact, the government has cashed in the retirement fund, the 401(k) of Federal employees, the G fund, in order to not exceed the debt limit set by Congress, because the leadership here doesn't want to admit to their profligacy. They will not allow a vote, an up-or-down vote here in the House, on raising the debt limit. So they are waiting for the Senate to sneak it into a really big bill on the Senate side, and then they can bring it back over here and pretend that they had nothing to do with it. I mean, who could have known the debt has gone up 45 percent in 5 years?

Well, it is time that they 'fessed up to what they are doing here. The fastest growing part of the Federal budget is not the entitlements which we hear so much about. We hear about those darned student loans that we cut last month so we could finance tax cuts for rich people; and those darned poor people who need health care that we cut last month to help finance tax cuts for rich people. Actually, the fastest part of the Federal deficit and budget is interest on the debt. That is true, interest on the debt, which will be \$247 billion next year. One quarter of \$1 trillion.

Now, that interest on the debt will not feed a single child. It will not help one young person get an education. It will not help one senior get a Medicare prescription drug benefit. It will not give one soldier help with needed equipment in the field. No, that \$250 billion, a quarter of \$1 trillion, will be paid out for profligacy and waste and debt.

What is even worse is, guess what, a lot of that money is not even flowing to investors here in the United States of America. This President has yet another record. He has, in 5 short years, created more foreign debt than the 42 Presidents that preceded him in office.

Now that is something. That is really something. One President, George Bush, has created more foreign debt than the 42 Presidents in more than 200 years that preceded him in office, this

fiscal conservative, this small-government guy.

How has he done it? Well, he has done it with a combination of increases in spending, a lot of corporate welfare, and tax cuts for rich people and major corporations, and subsidies to big corporations like in the energy bill, because there is not enough incentive at \$60 a barrel to drill for oil; we have to borrow money, the taxpayers do, give it to the oil companies and ask them to go out and look for oil. That was sort of the core of the Bush energy bill.

Mr. Speaker, 48 percent of our public debt is now held overseas. Japan holds \$687 billion, China is second and coming up fast at \$300 billion, and on down the list. This is something that puts the future of our country in jeopardy. Huge amounts of our debt washing around overseas in countries that might or might not have our best interests in mind long term, and might or might not want to continue to lend us money to help finance this profligacy.

So now the President is saying that he is really serious. This time around he is really serious about it. He says we are going to address this. We are going to cut the debt in half in the next 4 years. What he does not tell people is that most of that so-called reduction of the debt is by borrowing all of the surplus that is supposed to flow into the Social Security trust fund and spending it and not counting it as part of the debt.

So as the Social Security surplus grows, he says that he is moving us toward a balanced budget. Of course someday we are going to have to honor those bonds to pay future Social Security benefits. It is time for fiscal sanity here in Washington, D.C. We need a change in the Congress and the White House to get it.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE WARREN "PETE" OLDHAM

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month, the State of North Carolina lost a fine

man, former North Carolina Representative Warren "Pete" Oldham. I had the privilege of serving with Pete in the North Carolina General Assembly. While we did not always agree on every issue, I always respected and admired him for his commitment to constituent service and doing what he believed was right. He was always a very pleasant and polite person.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pete Oldham for a life focused upon helping others. Pete wore many hats during his life. He was a loving husband and father, an athlete, a teacher, a coach, a referee, a university official, a church leader, a public servant and a gardener.

Pete was born in Indianapolis, Indiana, to the late Reverend Philander and Minta Oldham. After serving in the Navy during World War II, he enrolled in Virginia Union University, in Richmond, Virginia, on a football scholarship. He transferred to Bluefield State College in Bluefield, West Virginia, where he graduated in 1951 with a bachelor of science degree in secondary education and majors in social studies and physical education. He then went on to receive a master of science degree in physical education in 1958 from West Virginia University, and his principal certification from North Carolina A&T State University in 1962.

Pete was a teacher and coach at Atkins High School from 1951 to 1963. He then went to work at Winston-Salem State University for over 20 years, where he retired as the school's registrar. During his time at the university, Pete always reserved time to coach high school and college students in basketball and football.

Pete was elected to the North Carolina House of Representatives in 1990 where we went on to become the co-chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. Twelve years later, he retired from the Chamber to care for his wife who was suffering from Alzheimer's disease. He said, "I made a vow and a commitment, and I intend to honor them."

Pete leaves behind his loving wife, Gladys, and daughters Donna Oldham and Leslie Oldham Bolden. My thoughts and prayers are with the family during this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina is fortunate to have been served by former Representative Warren "Pete" Oldham. He touched the lives of many and he will be missed.

IN HONOR OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of International Women's Day. More than 30 years ago, March 8 was designated by the United Nations as a day to reflect upon women's struggle for equality, justice,

peace and development. In the decades since, International Women's Day has become a holiday in many countries around the world, and acts as an annual catalyst for the advancement of women.

Throughout our history, the United States has been a leader in advancing women's rights and opportunity. While much work remains here and abroad, I join many of my colleagues and constituents in saluting the contributions of women around the world.

Many of those contributions have been made through the recent election of women political leaders. Chile, Jamaica, Germany and Liberia have all elected women to head their governments in the past 6 months. Despite this encouraging trend, governments led by women remain an anomaly. Only 11 out of the more than 200 members of the United Nations have women leaders. Moreover, there remains persistent underrepresentation of women serving as legislators, parliamentarians, and government ministers. Globally, women hold only 16 percent of all seats, a disappointing increase of only 5 percent since 1975. The 109th U.S. Congress boasts 84 female Members, the highest number in our history, but women still make up only 6.4 percent of the membership of the House and Senate, well below the world's average.

Development experts and advocates have long identified education as the key to improving women's well-being. More than 180 governments committed to achieving gender equality in education by 2005 as one of eight U.N. Millennium Development Goals, but we have a long way to go.

In the developing world, 60 million girls aged 6 to 11 are not in school, which severely limits their political, physical, and social opportunities.

In developed countries, an increasing number of women are pursuing higher education, but they have been unable to secure academic employment or research funding proportionate to their male colleagues. Policymakers have become increasingly concerned about a growing shortage of men on America's college campuses, but several important departments in our universities remain disproportionately the province of men, especially at the graduate level. The percentage of women earning advanced degrees in science or engineering is especially low. Only one in four master's degrees in these fast-growing fields is awarded to a woman. Even women who do earn Ph.D.s in computer science and engineering earn, on average, \$9,000 less per year than men in similar positions.

This income disparity is reflected throughout the workforce where women continue to face multiple impediments to their advancement. American women still earn an average of 25 percent less than their male colleagues, a wider wage gap than that in other developed countries, which affects women of all ages, races, and education levels. Unfortunately, the wage

disparity is being narrowed at a rate of less than half a penny a year.

In the 108th Congress, I was proud to cosponsor the Paycheck Fairness Act to combat gender-based wage discrimination by requiring that employees be educated about their rights, and permitting women to seek recourse under the Equal Pay Act.

There are some positive trends. While less than one third of employers in the developing world are women, this percentage is growing, especially in the United States. Between 1997 and 2004, the number of American companies primarily owned by women grew by 23 percent, well above the 9 percent overall increase in U.S. businesses during this period.

Here and abroad, though, women remain vulnerable to violence. I was proud to cosponsor the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005, and I have been a longtime advocate of efforts to prevent and treat domestic violence, child abuse, dating violence, and sexual assault. I have consistently advocated for greater Federal funding for research and treatment programs for breast cancer, ovarian cancer, heart disease and postpartum depression.

In acknowledging the challenges faced and overcome by women, I want to commend the sacrifices of America's brave women serving overseas, especially in Iraq. Women have served in every U.S. military conflict since the Revolution and have played an official role in the U.S. military for over 100 years. Today, women make up almost 15 percent of Active-Duty personnel. One in every seven U.S. soldiers in Iraq is a woman, and they are engaged in the conflict on a far greater scale than ever before, piloting helicopters, accompanying infantry on raids against insurgents, searching Iraqi women suspects for pistols and suicide belts. The contribution of American women has come at a high price. To date, 48 service women have been killed in Iraq and more than 300 have been wounded, but their service has inspired their compatriots on the front lines and here at home, as well as millions of women in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world, as symbols of women's courage and capacity. And today, we salute them and all women for their contributions.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is vacated.

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the vacated time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, in "The Glorious Quest," James R. Evans wrote, "No historian of the future will ever be able to prove that the ideas of individual liberty practiced in the United States of America were a failure. He may be able to prove that we were not yet worthy of them. The choice is ours."

I bring this to our attention, Mr. Speaker, because recently in a poll that was revealed by the McCormick Tribune Freedom Museum, a survey found out that on questions on the first amendment, one American in a thousand could name all five of the freedoms in the first amendment to the Constitution. However, in that same survey, 69 percent of those surveyed knew who the five members of the TV cartoon family "The Simpsons" was. They knew and could name all five members of the Simpson family.

I bring this to our attention because now more than ever, Mr. Evans' words ought to ring clear to us. And in that glorious quest that he talked about, educating ourselves and then using that education for political action was one of the most important things that we could do as Americans to sustain our form of government.

I bring this to our attention as well, because oftentimes I relish the opportunity to speak to students in my district, especially those in the honors government class. Invariably when I ask those students, whether they be high school seniors not too far off from casting their first vote to sustain this Republic, or to college freshmen somewhere in the curriculum, I ask them: Where do your freedoms come from? What are the source of your freedoms?

Many times they will raise their hand and say it is the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Only one in a thousand can name the five freedoms in the First Amendment. Those students are sorely fit, I would say, to go forward and lead this great Nation under our constitutional form of government, because, as I usually explain to them, actually the 10 amendments are a document of prohibition, not a document of establishment of freedoms. That is your birthright from when you were born.

That was the great magic of the Founding Fathers. For the first time, they elevated the individual above the crown, above the king, above royalty, above all else except he who created them. For the first time, the individual was elevated higher than anyone else on this Earth.

If I might, let me briefly read from the first 10 amendments. Amendment I: The prohibition. Congress shall make no laws.

Amendment II: Shall not be infringed.

Amendment III: Without the consent of the owner.

Amendment IV: The right of the people shall not be violated.

Amendment V: No person shall be held, nor shall any person be subjected, nor shall any person be compelled, nor shall any person be deprived, nor shall any private property be taken without just compensation.

Finally, amendment VIII: Shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor crucial and unusual punishment inflicted.

These are all documents of prohibition because they recognize that the first 10 amendments were not the source of our freedom. That is our birthright. These are documents of prohibition against government action.

So if only one in a thousand can tell us what those first five freedoms are, how can they establish, then, the freedom of speech and religion and press, and freedom to address the government with our grievances; and finally, the freedom of assembly. Two of the most important elements, at one time or another, to resist our government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by pointing once again to one of the Founding Fathers, which I often do, maybe to the boredom of some, but it was Ben Franklin, as he walked out of a little church in Philadelphia, who was asked by a citizen, Mr. Franklin, what form of government have you given us?

And he said, Madam, we have given you a republic. And it will fall to each and every generation to defend, to sustain, and to improve it.

Mr. Speaker, with the results of that poll, I would tell you that we are tardy in our work and we need to pick up the speed and educate our people as to the form of government that we got.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANOTHER RECORD TRADE DEFICIT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America's economic strength can be measured by her trade accounts, whether we are exporting more goods and services

than we are importing; and if we do export more than we import, America's economic strength grows. But when America imports more than she exports, her economic muscle weakens.

This chart that I brought to the floor this evening shows that since the mid-1970s, when America began signing very unbalanced trade agreements with other countries, every single year America began to import more than she exports. This last year of 2005, we had a historic trade deficit with the world totaling over \$750 billion, three quarters of \$1 trillion. Indeed, it was \$725 billion more in imports coming into our country than exports going out. This is not an insignificant amount. This has never happened to the United States of America before.

In January, America imported this year \$68.5 billion more in goods and services than we exported. This was an all-time high just for 1 month, an increase of over 5 percent from last December. This year in agriculture alone for the first time in American history since the Pilgrims settled, the United States will import more food than we export. Think about that. Think about what that means for America's independence, our birthright of independence.

According to Alan Tonelson at the U.S. Business and Industry Council, America's condition cannot be explained by high oil prices. That makes these numbers worse, but Mr. Tonelson says the January trends spotlight the continued decline of U.S. national competitiveness in "industries of the future," such as high-tech hardware and services, and throughout our vital manufacturing sector.

Today, many companies, airline companies, automotive parts companies like Delphi, a data corporation in my own district which just announced bankruptcy, all of them are teetering and a sign that imports are displacing what America used to make and send elsewhere. Today's report by the U.S. Department of Commerce suggests that the U.S. current account trade deficit for this year will probably surpass \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion; and that is on top of the \$9 trillion of public debt that has been amassed since 2000 in our country. Truly, we are a republic teetering financially, losing our independence because somehow we have to fund these gaps in what is owed publicly and in this trade account deficit. And we are borrowing in order to make up the difference, and we owe interest on those borrowings.

In order to sustain such an unprecedented and rapidly accumulating deficit, we are dependent on this massive borrowing from abroad and selling off valuable U.S. assets just like a fire sale, like you go to a pawn shop. To sustain a deficit like these, we are dependent upon investment by foreign agents like Dubai Ports World, which is in the headlines again today.

Our country cannot be secure, cannot be secure, from the defense standpoint

or financially under conditions like these. And yet after 12 years of evidence of the failure of trade agreements like NAFTA, Trade Representative Portman continues to negotiate trade deals like the CAFTA agreement. This year the administration intends to bring new trade agreements under the same failed model like the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement and an agreement with Colombia. Peru, a country that employs child labor, and Colombia, where labor leaders are more likely to be killed and are, summarily, more of them than anywhere else in the world.

How can our workers compete with these conditions? How can our small business people, how can our salaried executives compete with undemocratic places, no transparent legal system, no banking system that really functions openly?

The answer is we cannot. We simply cannot. So we are outsourcing everything to these places. And that is why imports are rising faster and faster and the people in those other places cannot afford to buy what is made by the people of this country who have sustained a middle-class life-style until now. Despite modest economic growth in our country, middle-class workers are not seeing any rise in their income. That is right: inflation-adjusted income for all households except the very wealthiest is flat. This may be the first generation in America when our children do not live as well as their parents before them. And you know what? The American people know it. They know it.

This is not the American Dream. This is the American nightmare.

Please sponsor the Balancing Trade Act, H.R. 4405, that would require action by the administration when we sustain these kinds of continued trade deficits with other nations. It is time for America to become independent again. It is time for America to restore her promise to all of her people.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when we have the opportunity of bringing tourists to this great Hall, we show them the ceiling, the cameos of all the great lawgivers in the world, two of whom are actually Americans.

On the Speaker's left up there is George Mason, one of three people who stayed through the entire Constitutional Convention and then at the end refused to sign the document because it did not include a Bill of Rights. It was important for him because he thought that was the purpose of actually preserving individual liberty for people.

I sometimes find it unique that those great Founding Fathers, the people we venerate, Hamilton, Madison, Washington, Franklin, Dickinson, and others, refused to add a Bill of Rights. It

was not because they were opposed to individual liberty. They found an alternative form of providing that particular liberty in the structure of government that we have.

One of the unwritten foundations of our system of government and the Constitution is the concept of federalism. We eventually did add a Bill of Rights, which is misnamed. It actually should be called a "bill of wrongs." It is a list of things that are wrong for the government to do no matter how many people want to do it.

But in addition to that, the Founding Fathers instilled within them a system of structure to preserve those same individual liberties. They realized that increasing the number of competitors of power is more significant than increasing the number of prohibitions listed. And what Madison said in his *Federalist Papers* about ambition counteracting ambition, they recognized very clearly as they established a system of government that had a horizontal separation of powers between the three branches of government but equally important to them was a vertical separation of powers between the national government and States, and the sole purpose of that structure was to preserve individual liberty.

The Federal Government has its role and function. There are certain things the Federal Government does. Well, what we bring to the table as the Federal Government is uniformity, which sometimes is a necessary need. If, indeed, uniformity is important, it is the Federal Government that can preempt States. But on the other hand, our States also bring something to the issue of governance. It is a State that can be innovative.

In one of these dissenting opinions in the 1920s, Justice Brandeis, and I will paraphrase, simply called the States the great laboratory of America where experimentation could be made without actually harming the entire country, where, indeed, creativity takes place. It is the States where justice can be maintained because there are mitigating circumstances in the lives of the individuals who make up this great Nation; and when you have a system that is uniform of one-size-fits-all, it cannot take account of all those mitigating circumstances. And, indeed, in having uniformity, we often harm people in the process of doing that.

The Federal Government is not vicious. It does not intend to do harm. But its very design of one-size-fits-all means that individual needs cannot be met and only State and local government can do that.

Our goal as the Congress should not be to create a more efficient government, a kinder and gentler way of controlling people. Our goal as the Federal Government should be to do less, to move the decisions of power from this city back to States and localities where creativity, where justice, where innovation can actually take place. If we do so, if we move those decision

centers, we ennoble the spirit of this country. We empower people to solve their own problems in creative ways, and we may even learn something in the process.

In so doing, I am very grateful that the gentleman from New Jersey, who will be speaking in a minute to you, Representative GARRETT of New Jersey, has initiated a 10th Amendment Caucus aimed at trying to once again bring back those principles so we clearly understand this important lesson, the structural need that the Founding Fathers put into our system of government.

The 10th amendment, the last of the Bill of Rights, is still there. It clearly states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution . . . are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

If we, indeed, learn that lesson, what I hope will be happening through this effort, spearheaded by Congressman GARRETT, will be an effort to illustrate, as time goes on, how the overhelpful hand of the Federal Government can actually harm people, not intentionally, but unintentionally actually harm people. We hope, as time goes on, to bring specific initiatives which will help this country reach the goal the Founding Fathers had of providing personal liberty by a strong balance of power between the national and State levels. For if Congress is willing to lose that power, the people will gain personal liberties in the process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the *Extensions of Remarks*.)

INTRODUCING THE CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS' WEEKLY CONSTITUTION HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to announce what we begin as hopefully a regular occurrence here on the House floor. Members of the Congressional Constitution Caucus will use these opportunities to highlight for our colleagues and for the Nation the need, justification, and plan to ensure that our government is operating consistently with our Founding Fathers' intent, and that is limited, leaving most authority over domestic issues to the States, local governments, and the people themselves.

As the founder of this caucus, a caucus dedicated to the adherence of the 10th amendment, I strongly believe that this body must begin to be more squarely focused on these important

constitutional principles that we have already heard tonight.

Before I begin, let me express my sincere gratitude to my friend from Utah, who has volunteered to lead this effort here on the floor, this important education effort, but has also been a consistent and long-time champion of the notion of a limited and effective and efficient Federal Government. He routinely fights to ensure that his home State and the other States as well are entrusted with the authority and oversight promised to them as each was admitted to this Union.

I look forward to working with the other members of the caucus, as well, who share the sentiment that our Federal Government has taken far too much authority over programs that State governments have traditionally been much more effective in administering. And I invite my other colleagues to join with us.

This is really as old as our Nation itself. Our founders were very clear when establishing our system of government. They intended to set up a republic of sovereign States capable of self-governing, with a small, central government with clearly defined and limited powers.

Only the powers specifically limited and set out in the Constitution are to be administered by the Federal Government. All others are to be left to the States, local governments, or to the people themselves.

Dividing sovereignty between the Federal Government and those of the States and localities prevents an unhealthy concentration of power at any one level of government, and this is something that James Madison in *The Federalist* No. 51 wrote is a "double security" for the people.

Unfortunately, throughout the last few generations in particular, the intent of the 10th amendment, that of a limited and efficient central government, has basically melted away. There are those who support a bigger, more centralized government. They believe that a government-run bureaucracy can make the best decisions for the American people. They believe the good is in higher taxes. Well, sir, I strongly disagree. As a Member of the House Budget Committee, I am very much aware of where this leads our government, an overbloated Federal Government, consumed by deficits of over \$400 billion that delivers sub-par public service.

Congress on almost a daily basis allows our government to grow, to push us further into debt and to take away from the limits imposed on the historic day when the Constitution was first ratified. What every Member of Congress needs to ask themselves each time they slide their card into one of these spots and votes, they must ask, does the bill I am voting on violate the U.S. Constitution? Does it take away the rights promised to our constituents and put them in the hands of the bureaucracy here in D.C. instead?

Mr. Speaker, I remind this body, the Constitution does not only protect the rights of the people, it also protects the rights of the States. This is our responsibility, to remember them when we write, debate and vote on legislation here in this Chamber.

What I am urging here is not only a political philosophy that most would argue has drifted from the mainstream, but a most important one that has affected our budget, and a gloomy budget forecast it has been for the future.

This is what the caucus is about, these weekly information sessions. It is really well past time that we turn a critical eye on to the Federal Government. This will be how we will lower our deficit, grow our economy and ensure that America remains that "beacon on the Hill."

Now, aside from being informational, this caucus also seeks to make specific legislative gains in the name of governmental efficiency and constitutional adherence. We will support legislation that seeks to return power and authority back to where it belongs, to the States, to the local governments and to the people.

So, to close, I look forward to working with my friend from Utah and other members of this caucus and other Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle, as we work each week in the days and weeks ahead. We owe nothing less to our constituents and to generations, both past and future, to defend this great experiment of American republicanism and democracy.

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD ON THE HISTORY OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the Official Truth Squad tonight is going to continue the theme that has already been addressed by three of our friends, Mr. OTTER from Idaho, Mr. BISHOP from Utah and Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey. They have been talking about our history. They have been talking about the philosophy of America and who we are and what we are and what we stand for. So for the next few minutes we will be discussing our history, the American Revolution, the people who lived before us, what they thought, what they wrote, and what they said.

I have with me tonight my friend from Texas, another freshman, Mr. CONAWAY from West Texas, and he is going to start out discussing our heritage and giving us some truth about who we are, what we are, and what we stand for.

Mr. CONAWAY. Judge, I thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to share this hour with you tonight and to be able to discuss these very important topics with our colleagues in the House.

One of the things that occurred to me while I have been here in Congress is that we don't do a real good job of delineating between the role of the Federal Government and everybody else. There is a great push every single day while we are here to expand the reach, to expand the scope, to expand the Federal Government's role in all of our lives. One of the reasons for that is I don't think we have a really good, clear appreciation for our founding documents.

So I have introduced a bill, H. Res. 485, called the America Act, a modest effort to reinstitute the Constitution in America, which would require every Member of Congress, every Representative, every Senator, to read the Constitution once a year. It would also require our senior staffers to also read the Constitution, because an awful lot of what you and I do every single day is somewhat influenced by what our staff does; the idea being that you and I raise our hand in January of every odd-numbered year, one of the seminal moments of my short term here in this Congress in January of 2005 when we stood up to take our oath of office. We pledge to protect and defend the Constitution. In our role as lawmakers, we write laws to implement the Constitution, and, every once in a while, we attempt to change the Constitution.

So it seems pretty self-evident to me we should know what is in the Constitution, and, given the reach of this Federal Government over the years, it seems we may have lost our way with respect to that.

When the Constitution was being written 230-plus years ago, there was a constant struggle or tension, as has already been discussed on this floor tonight, of what the role of the Federal Government should and should not be. Those headed up by Alexander Hamilton thought a wide-ranging, wide-reaching government would be appro-

priate. Others, such as Adams and Jefferson, thought a much more narrow interpretation of the Constitution would narrow the scope of this Federal Government.

I doubt that if our Founding Fathers could join us today, that even the strongest proponents of the most expansive Federal Government would recognize what we have done under the Constitution with this Federal Government. It reaches into every single portion of our lives.

You and I also, when we campaign and when we are talking on this Hill, talk about reducing the size of government, reducing Federal spending, the threat that the growth in spending has to our way of life.

The real solution, in my mind, is going to lead to some hard decisions that sweep major programs, major perhaps Cabinet-level agencies, out of the Federal Government; a clear recognition that this Federal Government should be limited; that there should be certain things that are totally left up to the States. I am not going to name any of those tonight, because that is going to create some controversy when we begin to talk about that.

The truth of the matter is if we are, in fact, going to rein in the growth of the Federal Government, we have to begin limiting the reach into particular areas that our Founding Fathers did not envision. So a modest step, a new effort to try to help each of us understand clearer what our role should be and what this Federal Government's role should be in our day-to-day lives, will be a reading of the Constitution.

So I am going to begin asking each of my colleagues to cosponsor and join this effort to pass this resolution that would require all of us to read the Constitution once a year. It is going to be an honor system. We are honorable men and women in this body, and I think we can trust ourselves.

I am a CPA by trade. You are an attorney. Our professions all require continuing professional education: doctors, lawyers, engineers, CPAs. CPAs in particular have to have 40 hours a year of continuing education just to stay current.

It seems to me that politicians and folks serving this body should be as well informed about their job as anybody serving in a profession should be informed, and the start of that would be the Constitution, the base document on which this great hall is founded.

So this requirement would require each of us to read that Constitution once a year, and record that in our records, and be available for constituents to ask us, now, when is the last time you read the Constitution, Mr. Congressman?

I want to thank my good colleague from Texas, the great judge from the southeast part of the State. We are from the same State, but we are probably 600 miles apart in our homes. But it is a wonderful State to represent,

and I am honored to have TED POE and the freshman group with me this year. I want to thank you for giving me this time to share this hour with you tonight.

Mr. POE. Thank you, Mr. CONAWAY. You made several excellent points about our heritage. Reading the Constitution is certainly something that all Members of this body ought to do on a regular basis.

I would hope all school teachers in this country would pick up this document, read it from time to time, and have their kids read this document. It is not very long. I have with me a pocket Constitution and Declaration of Independence that many of us in this House carry with us every day.

Your comment about taking an oath to uphold the Constitution: Not only do Members of the United States House of Representatives raise their right hand and swear to uphold the United States Constitution, but every elected official in this country takes that same oath. Members of the Supreme Court take it, the President takes it, every State representative, State senator, the Governor of every State. Every peace officer takes that oath, every member of a city council, every school board, every person in public service in our country takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. It is the only oath that most of us take while we are serving in office. It certainly is an oath that we are obliged to follow.

Several years ago the world was divided between free and unfree, and we had this Iron Curtain that existed in much of the world that separated those of us who are free and those that were not free. After the great wall came down, we heard many stories about those oppressed people who lived behind the Iron Curtain and what their life was like in that political slavery in which they found themselves.

Several prisons throughout the Eastern Bloc of Europe housed political prisoners, one of which was a Czechoslovakian student who had been imprisoned and sentenced to 5 years for reading from a prohibited document in that Communist nation.

What he did, he found himself on the steps of Prague University. He stood there, defiant, and quoted a document from history. It went something like this: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness."

For reading from that document, that Czechoslovakian student went to prison. Yes, that is a portion of the Declaration of Independence, our Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence justified to the world our independence from Great Britain. It gave the reasons why we had the divine right to leave that country.

It starts out, "When in the course of human Events, it becomes necessary

for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation."

That is how the Declaration of Independence starts. It gives the justification, the divine right, for an independent Nation, and, first and foremost, sets the parameters on where we get rights.

As many in this body do, I from time to time talk to kids in schools, the younger the better; talk to them about America and our history, our glorious history. And I ask the question many times to students, where do you get your rights? And I hear all kinds of answers. "My parents give me the rights." "Teachers give me rights." "The government gives me rights." More often than not, most of them say, I don't know where I get my rights.

But the Declaration of Independence establishes to the world, first and foremost, where we receive those rights.

So there is no misunderstanding. Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence wrote it down, that was later signed by 54 signers of the Declaration of Independence, that "We hold these Truths to be self-evident." The truth. It is obvious. That is what that means. We hold these truths to be obvious. "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by," and notice what the word is, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't say government. It says "their Creator, with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

We live in a time where in our society we don't want to talk too much about the Almighty.

□ 1730

Or we may offend somebody. We may get sued. Our schools may get sued if they happen to mention God in the public school system.

Well, they are going to have to mention the Creator if they are going to mention the Declaration of Independence, because the philosophy of who we are is that we receive our dignity not from government but from a creator, from a supernatural being.

And the rights that we have come from the creator. Many times we hear about the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but for some reason we seldom say where those rights come from.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big deal. It is not a minor deal. Because, you see, government does not have any rights; only people have rights. Government has power. And it gets power from us, the people. We are higher than government. We are not lower than government.

And this philosophy was new in 1776. Always before, the King was most powerful

or the dictator was most powerful, or the military; Caesar was most powerful, not the people.

And so when our forefathers got together and started talking about this concept of freedom and independence and America, they knew that the rights that they wanted to talk about did not come from the King; they did not come from a dictator; and they did not come from some military official. They came from the Creator.

Because, you see, if they came from government, that means government can take them away. And the only way government gets its power is from us, the people. So the most important phrase in the Declaration of Independence establishes that the rights that we all claim to have come from a creator.

It is interesting to note when Thomas Jefferson first penned the Declaration of Independence, his first draft, the three rights that he mentioned were life, liberty and property. But after it was debated, the issue was changed from property to pursuit of happiness.

You know, it is important that we understand some basic principles about our past and who we are. Tonight, Mr. CONAWAY and several others have mentioned Alexander Hamilton. And Alexander Hamilton understood that principle that Jefferson wrote about, that our forefathers signed.

And he said in 1775, a year before Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, that sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchment or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of the Divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

One of our forefathers, once again speaking to the absolute truth, that rights that we have are because of a creator. And we have that right, those rights, because of the dignity and worth of the individuals, all of them because of that.

Now, government seems to be very powerful nowadays, our Federal Government does. As Mr. CONAWAY mentioned, I doubt if our forefathers would believe the power of the Federal Government over the people.

Now, whether we think it is a good idea or not, the power is tremendous. Now, think about the different things the Federal Government has gotten itself involved in since the Revolutionary War. For example, I will give you one minor example. Where in our Constitution do we give the Federal Government the authority to decide what every toilet bowl in the United States looks like and how much water runs through it?

But yet the Federal Government has assumed that authority, that power. And you can go on and on and on talking about the role of government and the power of government. But I think all of us would agree the Federal Government today is more powerful than it ever has been.

And every time we give government power, I am talking about the people, because we give them that authority, because government does not have any rights, we take a little bit of liberty away from the rest of us every time government makes those decisions.

And there is a difference between the government in control and having all authority, and the independent or the people having authority. I have used the example of the Iron Curtain and Communism. There are many Americans today who did not live during the time of what we call the Cold War or during the time and have watched what occurred behind the Iron Curtain.

I had the opportunity back in 1987, almost 20 years ago now, to go to the Soviet Union and it was the Soviet Union at that time, a Communist nation that believed that the state was all powerful and all authority and rights went to the state.

And the state doled those responsibilities and duties out to the people. But all citizens looked at the "Almighty State."

And I spent some time there traveling different portions of the Soviet Union. Quite an experience. Different than being here in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

But some examples of that. When I went to the Soviet Union, there was only just three of us that went over there. All of us were judges. And everywhere we went, we were followed. Usually by the KGB. We were followed two ways. Sometimes we were followed with the KGB agents right behind us. He or she wanted us to know that they are there. That was about half of the time.

Other times we were followed, and we knew that we were being followed, but they were where we could not see them. But every place we went, we were followed by the government.

We stayed in hotels in the Soviet Union. And the way it worked was you would give your passport to someone at the end of the hall, and they would give you a key to your room. When you left your room, you gave your key back to the person in charge, and they gave you your passport back.

They would also give you a slip of paper that allowed you to get out of the hotel. You needed that piece of paper and your passport to get back into the hotel. If you did not have this government document, you never got back into the hotel.

While we were gone, our hotel room was searched every time. And those who searched our rooms wanted us to know that the room was searched. Our phones were bugged. We could tell, when we were listening to phone, that it was constantly bugged.

And the people in the Soviet Union, you know, they are good people. But you could tell by the way they walked and carried on their daily lives they were oppressed. What were they oppressed with? The power of government in their personal and private lives, be-

cause government completely controlled everything, from where they worked, to their health care system, to where they lived, to whether they could even leave the city on a little vacation. Total government control of the individuals, because government had to assert the individual's worth and had taken it on as the power of the state.

And we got to talk to a few Soviet citizens. They were very skeptical about talking to Americans. They would usually tell you directions, but they never wanted to talk much about life in the Soviet Union because, you see, there is a crime under the former Soviet regime that said it is a crime to engage in anti-Soviet activity.

Now, that is a very broad statement. What is anti-Soviet activity? Well, it is anything that the government says it is: talking to the wrong person, taking a photograph of a particular building, writing something in a letter, trying to get on television to say something about the government. Any of those could be engaging in anti-Soviet activity and would cause this citizen to be arrested and tried by that oppressive government.

After we left the Soviet Union, we flew out on a Soviet aircraft, Soviet commercial aircraft. There were not very many of us on the plane. We are all Westerners. As soon as the pilot comes on and announces in English that we are leaving the airspace of the Soviet Union and are now entering the airspace of Finland, everyone on the airplane immediately cheered.

I mean, it was spontaneous cheering. And when we were getting off the airplane in Europe, I asked this flight attendant, I said, what did you think about all of us Westerners cheering when we got out of the Soviet Union? He said, it did not surprise me, because it happens every time we fly out of the Soviet Union.

So the oppression in the Soviet Union was lifted because of the people in the Soviet Union and the people in the Free World. And that is why freedom is so important, because it is not just something Americans possess or want; it is something everybody wants. The people in the Soviet Union want freedom just like those people in Iraq want freedom, and Afghanistan, because it changes the worth of the individuals and puts the individuals most important and puts government below the individuals.

And that is exactly the way it ought to be. You know, the 54 signers of the Declaration of Independence, some people have said when our country got together and started, those 54 people from all walks of life, many of them very wealthy in their own right, were the smartest and wisest people that ever existed as a group in American history to formulate these concepts of freedom.

And the purpose of the Declaration of Independence was to establish the reasons why we had the right as a people

to leave an oppressive government, Great Britain; and it was justified and outlined in the Declaration of Independence.

After the Declaration of Independence was signed and the war with Great Britain was won, after several years, it was noted that freedom is always expensive, it costs the lives of other freedom fighters, because it is that important that life is put on the line for freedom. Success occurred. The Nation was free. But we did not have a basic rule of law to follow as a people. We started with the Articles of Confederation and basically the Articles of Confederation gave the Federal Government very limited authority.

And so our Framers got together again at the Constitutional Convention and drafted the Constitution that we have now. There were 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention; 39 of them signed the Constitution. Several of them did not, one of whom was Patrick Henry, one of my heroes from Virginia: Give me liberty or give me death.

He would not sign the Constitution. The reason he did not is because it did not ensure and protect individual liberty or what we now call the Bill of Rights. The average age was 42.

A French diplomat that was here in the United States at the time made this comment about those people who got together to frame our government. He said that never before, even in Europe, had there been an assembly of more respectable people for talent, knowledge, disinterestedness and patriotism to a cause than these that are assembled here, talking about our forefathers who got together to frame this document called the United States Constitution.

And before they started discussing this document, the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, who was in his 80s at the time, said that if the Good Lord above is concerned about a sparrow that falls out of a tree, certainly he would be concerned about a new nation at its birth, and maybe we should ask for his guidance through prayer.

And when he made that statement, those men at the Constitutional Convention got together and prayed before they wrote that document. That is one reason why in this House every morning we start with a prayer, needing Divine guidance and wisdom for the decisions we make.

□ 1745

And so when they set up this new concept it started out with the simple phrase in the Preamble that, "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

So the Constitution starts out with the purpose of government and why we

as a people get together and form government. Government's main duty is to protect us, protect us from domestic and foreign enemies.

The Constitution established three branches of government. It established the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch; and, if you read the Constitution, established it in that order.

This is part of the legislative branch. We call this the people's House. The reason we call this the people's House is because to be in the United States Congress as a Representative, you have to be elected. You cannot be appointed to the United States Congress. Even on a vacancy, there has to be an election.

So all Members of this House, all 435 of us are elected somewhere in these United States, each representing about, now, 651,000 citizens.

Down the hallway we have the second house, the United States Senate, two Members from every State in the United States. And when the Senate was first designed, the Senate's purpose was to represent States, and the representation of each State was put with two Senators, U.S. Senators. At first the legislative bodies of each State determined who the Senators were. And later, by a constitutional amendment, that was changed so that the people of the whole State elected their Senators.

So we have the people's House, we have the United States Senate down the hallway. And the reason we call that the Senate and this the people's House is because, even in the Senate, if there is a vacancy, there can be an appointment by the Governor until there is an election. And that was put as the basis for all democracy because we represent the will of the people of the United States of America in making our decisions.

Down the street is the second branch of government, the President of the United States and the Vice President, the executive branch of government. The purpose of the legislative branch is to write the law, or, I call it, write the will of the people. That is what we are supposed to do. That is what we are supposed to do, write the will of the people, enact the law and the will of the people. The President's, the executive branch, is to carry out the will of the people.

Unlike the House of Representatives, we are elected for 2 years, the Senate is elected for 6, the President is elected for 4 years. The second branch of government.

The third branch of government is on the other side of this House. It is across the street here. It is called the Supreme Court of the United States, the judicial branch of government. Members of the judiciary are appointed for life, at least in our Federal systems. I was not appointed for life. I had to stand for elections as a judge in Texas, and many States elect their judges, but in the Federal system judges are appointed for life.

So we have, in the middle, the legislative branch; down the street, we have the executive branch; and we have the judicial branch. And I think it is worthy to note that in the Constitution our forefathers envisioned that this body, Congress, should be the most powerful branch of government because we represent the people. The people put us here. And so that was their philosophy.

The second most powerful branch of government was to be the executive to carry out the law, the President. The weakest branch of government was to be the judiciary because, you see, they are not elected. They are appointed for life. And they were to interpret law to the extent that if a law passed by Congress was passed, and it violated the Constitution, it was to be overturned, and Congress was supposed to write another law that would pass muster.

It is interesting to note that that symbolism of Congress being the most powerful, legislative branch most powerful, the President being the second most powerful, and the judiciary being the weakest even occurs here in this House at the State of the Union message that just happened not too many weeks ago. And if you recall, Mr. Speaker, at the State of the Union message, at the top of the rostrum the Speaker of the House of Representatives was there along with the Vice President. The Vice President is the Speaker of the Senate.

The legislative branch was at the top of the podium. The President spoke from the second podium below the legislative branch. When President Bush spoke, he was below the legislative branch. And it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court of the United States sits even lower, down here on the House floor. It is symbolic of the way that our forefathers meant for government to work.

Even though that was the way they established our country and the Constitution, it is not that way anymore. I think few would argue that no longer is the legislative branch the most powerful branch of government. It is the weakest branch of government. The President is still the second most powerful branch of government, the executive branch. But the judiciary is now the most powerful branch of government; because, you see, in many cases the judiciary has taken over the role of not just the judiciary but the legislative branch. When they find a law they do not like, they do more than rule it unconstitutional; they move it a step further and legislate the way things, in their opinion, ought to be.

I personally think that is a disservice to our Constitution. Hopefully those nine men and women down the street will understand that their role in government was to be people who interpret the Constitution and not pass law. That is one reason myself and Judge Gohmert resigned as judges. We want to make law and pass law rather than interpret the law.

So in any event, that was the way our Constitution envisioned we were to work things and how this government we have is to function. The Constitution was inadequate because it did not provide for a protection of citizens of their basic rights. And we have even heard tonight some comments about the Bill of Rights, and it is really more than a Bill of Rights that we have. It is a bill of prohibitions against government.

If you go through and read each of the amendments to the Constitution, especially the first 10 amendments, you will see that the amendment's purpose is to protect us from government. It does not bestow rights on government. It bestows more prohibitions on government, on how government is to treat the people. And I will just mention one of these basic rights or amendments tonight.

The first amendment. It is first for a reason. It did not just happen to show up first. The people who put that first had an absolute commonsense reason for establishing the first amendment to be first because of what it says. That Congress shall make no law, it does not seem very difficult to understand that, Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

That is basically two rules that Congress, that is us, cannot violate. We cannot as a body establish a national religion. You see, the Church of England was a national religion and our forefathers, one of the reasons they came over here was because of religious persecution in Europe, England, and other places. And they did not want to uphold the national religion, and to prevent that from happening here in the United States, Congress was prevented from establishing a national religion.

You notice it says "religion." It does not say "prohibition about the Almighty." It says "establishing religion." And also Congress cannot make any laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Now, the first amendment and the first phrase was first for a reason: because our forefathers wanted to practice religion and religious freedom, and they wanted government to stay out of the way of both of those.

Now, I wonder whether or not we are balancing these two prohibitions. Is government allowing in our country the free exercise of religion or not? And it all comes to the interpretation of this very simple phrase. The second right and prohibition by government is Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech.

The freedom of speech was second in the Bill of Rights. Or freedom of press.

And you notice it does not say "fair press." It just says a "free press." That is what we are guaranteed. The right to have a free press, not necessarily fair, because fair is always in the eyes of the

reader. In any event, the rights of freedom of speech and press were next, and then the right of us, the people, to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress.

You see, these rights are first because if you do not have these, the rest of them in the Bill of Rights do not mean anything. And when this speech phrase was put here, it was put here because there were two types of speech our forefathers wanted to protect: religious speech and political speech. You see, that is the controversy. You could not say what you wanted to say about the king. You might get in trouble. And so political speech is protected. Religious speech is protected. And that is why you have the right of freedom of speech and, of course, the right of press. And a free press protects the rights in this amendment and all the others as well. And, of course, the right of the people to assemble and petition the government.

So as we progress in the next few weeks, we will talk more about our Constitution in detail, hopefully getting some interest in the American public, into reading this book. Most books like this have the Declaration of Independence in it and then the Constitution.

The Declaration of Independence was the promise. The Constitution was the fulfillment of that promise. And it is a philosophy our forefathers had that we still are arguing and debating about tonight and debating in this House on a constant basis. It is the idea of freedom from government, or government controlling us. That is the choice we make every time we pass legislation.

Every time we give government more authority, we are taking more authority and responsibility from us, the individual and the people, and willingly giving it to government. Maybe we should do that and maybe we should not. But freedom is something that is very valuable. It is, in fact, the most valuable thing that any of us as individuals have or will ever have. And that is why the Founders of our country believed and died and lost so much to be free from British rule.

It is now a world we live in, where many countries are free, that raise the value and worth of the individual to its highest level and put government below the people. And in this country we must constantly be vigilant to protect the people from government, because it is government's responsibility to do our will, not our responsibility to do government's will. Our will is paramount to the government's. And the only way government gets authority is because we decide to give it authority over the rest of us.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to spend these few minutes talking about these great two documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States. And as the weeks progress, we will talk more about these truths that are self-evident, that these two docu-

ments are who we are, what we are, what we stand for, and what we will continue to stand for.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1053. An act to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine.

□ 1800

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor once again to come before the House. I would like to thank Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi for allowing us to have the time and the Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER; Mr. CLYBURN, our chairman; and Mr. LARSON, our vice-chair.

Mr. Speaker, we have been coming to the floor all this week. We are going to be talking tonight about our plans to hopefully move this country forward. Maybe we can work together in doing that in a bipartisan way. Mr. RYAN is here at the top of the hour tonight, and I am so glad that you are here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here. We have a lot to talk about again, as we wrap up another week of business here at the Capitol.

There are a lot of issues facing our country, and I had a lot of meetings this week on different issues: education, folks in about manufacturing, about the local economy and the problems that they are having with pension and health care.

I think if you look at what is happening in the country, you will see that most Americans either intellectually or in their gut realize that the country is going in the wrong direction.

So our plan tonight, as we come here several nights a week, is to try to let the American people know that we are moving them forward.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to say that, trying to let them know that we are moving forward because that is what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to move this country in the right direction. Unfortunately, I must add there has been a lot of discussion here under the Capitol dome about who we are going to do business with, how we are going to do business with them, and how we are going to prevent ourselves from getting into a situation like this ongoing port situation that is some back-room deal that took place with a special com-

mittee, and we are finding out more and more about it each day.

When we start, I do not really want to focus on that, Mr. Speaker. I want to focus on the fact that we talk about working in a bipartisan way. The Republican Party here in this House is in the majority. That means that the majority has the opportunity to lead in a comprehensive way, including all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, as we start to move down the road to not only making this country financially secure but secure its borders and secure all America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the issues that I think is a fundamental issue that we have in the country facing us is the issue of balancing the budget here and making sure that our country pays its bills. The Republican majority has not been able to get themselves together in a comprehensive way, as you said, to try to balance the budget here in the United States.

I want to just make a point here, and we have got several charts I think that are pretty powerful in illustrating this point.

The Republicans have increased the debt limit, Mr. Speaker, by \$3 trillion, \$3 trillion. This Republican Congress, Mr. Speaker, has said to the Treasury Department, go ahead out and borrow that money. In June of 2002, increased by \$450 billion. In May of 2003, increase of \$984 billion. In November of 2004, \$800 billion, and we have an increase coming that is going to probably come in the next couple weeks of another \$781 billion. Over \$3 trillion this Republican Congress has okayed for the Treasury to go out and borrow because this Republican Congress does not have the fiscal responsibility or the discipline to rein in spending.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. There is no probably about it. You are saying they probably will raise the debt ceiling. There is no probably about it. It is going to happen.

We have our rubber stamp here because you know that they are going to rubber-stamp this deal. They are going to take this stamp out, and they are going to rubber-stamp raising the debt ceiling. What does that mean? What that means, by some \$821 billion, raising the debt ceiling, even more, beyond where it is now, and that is just the number that I received recently that Secretary Snow has predicted we need to raise the debt ceiling by.

It is because of the love affair with special interests, giving oil companies more subsidies or more money in the time that they are making record profits. It is when the President says let us make tax cuts permanent for billionaires, knowing that we have been fiscally irresponsible, Mr. Speaker; and I think it is important, I was about to just give some information that is pretty fresh about what happened last night in Appropriations Committee, and I think it is important for us to reflect on this.

We talk about bipartisanship. We talk about working in a comprehensive

way. We are trying to make that happen. Like you said, we are trying to bring this government back into pay-as-you-go fiscal responsibility, making sure that we do things in the right way.

I just want to say that the Democrats, we want to keep America safe, and I know Republicans want to do it, too; but we are following the 9/11 Commission recommendations of trying to move towards 100 percent container screening. Now, there are some other countries on the globe, I know one in particular, that is doing that, and I think it is important for us to be the superpower of the world, we are supposed to be financial superpower of the world, and we are only checking less than 5 or 6 percent of containers; and I think it is important that I point this out. That is not what Democrats called for. That is what the 9/11 Commission called for, because we believe in working with those that have researched issues and flushed them out so that we can move forward in protecting Americans.

It is not something that came out of the back rooms of some Democratic club somewhere in Sioux City, Iowa. This came about by professionals coming together, past Members of this House, Governors, security people, testimony from FBI, CIA, port directors, individuals that specialize in terrorism.

That is just like our innovation plan. We did not over a cup of coffee and a muffin say, well, what do you think our innovation plan should be, and write it on a napkin. We went out to the CEOs. We went out to the universities of higher learning. We went out to everyday, front-line employers and asked them what do you think we should do as it relates to innovation and where we are lagging. We went to students that are trying to get into the math and sciences and said what do you need.

We went out and we talked to America. We did not just come up with a plan in the back rooms, and we definitely did not get in a room with the special interests and say let us write a bill like the oil industry has had the opportunity to do and some other industries have had an opportunity to do.

I am not holding the oil industry or any other industry at fault here. They are just doing their job. I hold the Republican majority at fault that has allowed us to get in a situation that we are in now.

Real quick, I just want to make sure, just fresh from last night, from the Appropriations Committee, we offered amendments to strengthen how government reviews foreign transactions by mandating a review of all foreign transactions. That amendment was offered, and it was voted down. All Democrats voted for it. Republicans voted against it with the exception of one Republican that voted with the Democrats. That is strengthening, making sure that all transactions are

reviewed, not just a few, but all so that we do not have to continue to walk down the same road.

The second vote that came about was by Mr. SABO, basically providing \$3.4 billion for critical homeland security shortfalls, including a \$1.5 billion for port security needs. I think that it is important to say that, again: party-line vote, 27 Democrats voted for it, 34 Republicans voted against it.

I am glad that we get this information from the committees, and we are sharing with not only the Members who probably were not, there some Members with respect in the Appropriations Committee because all Members are not on the Appropriations Committee, but also, the American people should know. The American people should know exactly what we are trying to do here.

When I say trying, we are trying. If we were in the majority, it would be done. We would have all transactions reviewed dealing with foreign countries. It will happen. We would have had a Hurricane Katrina commission by now, and we would be taking action on what we should do to correct it, and so the oversight would have been different on Katrina. So I think it is important to bring these fresh votes to the floor, not even 24 hours ago.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, just as you were saying, this is what you were saying: only 5 percent of the cargo coming in is inspected. Mr. Speaker, our source on this one, our third-party validator on this one, is Fox News. So that is where we are.

Now, here is the recommendation from the Coast Guard. Their own estimates, this is the U.S. Coast Guard and I know you have a Coast Guard, probably more than one facility, down in Miami, in the intercoastal for sure, but this is what the Coast Guard estimates that they may need, \$7 billion in order to secure and meet their obligations through the Transportation Security Act. Here is what Congress has appropriated, \$900 million, not even \$1 billion. We need to be here. Here is where we are.

Now, what have the Democrats tried to do? We have been very aggressive and assertive and proactive in trying to make sure that we meet the obligations to protect and secure our own ports. This is just a laundry list. I am going to run through them real quick here.

November 28 of 2001, DAVE OBEY from Wisconsin tried to put \$200 million in grants for port security and studies. Republicans knocked it down 216-211 in a party-line vote.

April of 2003, another OBEY amendment for \$722 million to increase security. Again, 221-200. All the Republicans prevented us from increased port security.

Again, Democrats, June 17 of 2003, OBEY again, \$500 million, shot down, party-line vote.

June 24 of 2003, OBEY again, Republicans blocked consideration of that amendment by a vote of 222-200.

All of the Republicans are voting to prevent the increase in funding just by a few hundred million dollars. It is not like we want to even say we are going to go for the whole \$7 billion that we need, but we are trying to slowly increase the funding for this so we can make sure that we are protecting our ports.

Again, in September 17 of 2003, OBEY, SABO and Senator BYRD tried to increase funding to enhance ports by \$475 million. Republicans defeated that amendment on a party-line vote.

Again, June 9 of 2004, Mr. Speaker, again, again and again; June 18 of 2004; October 7 of 2004; again and again, September 29 of 2005, \$300 million, again shot down along party lines. March 2 of 2006, again.

Mr. Speaker, we have a real problem here because it seems that every time that the Democrats want to increase funding even marginally to protect our ports, there is a Republican party-line vote that prevents us from doing that. That is what the Democrats are trying to do.

That is our plan.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I heard Mr. MEEK mention the lack of oversight that occurs within this institution, within this branch; and it is a very serious problem, and many have spoken to it.

What I found interesting, while I was at my desk, a friend and colleague of ours, I think it was Mr. CONAWAY from Texas, talked about a bill that he has, I presume, already filed, which would require Members of Congress to read the Constitution once a year.

I listened to him with some fascination, and I would propose that he should consider expanding that particular proposal to include a recognition that a constitutional responsibility of the House of Representatives is oversight of the executive branch and that every Member of Congress should make a solemn pledge before God to honor that responsibility, to conduct oversight.

□ 1815

Because I believe if every single Member of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, respected that constitutional principle, we would not be beset by the problems that are becoming obvious to the American people. But I didn't hear any mention of that by our friend and colleague, Mr. CONAWAY.

We are not meeting our constitutional responsibility because the majority party, the Republican Party in this branch, refuses, refuses to conduct oversight of the executive branch because of fear of embarrassing the White House. Well, again, their constitutional responsibility does not flow to the White House. Their constitutional responsibility, Mr. Speaker, goes to the American people, not to the White House.

I mean, it is remarkable that during the course of the Bush Presidency we have failed to conduct in-depth probes about some of the most serious allegations of executive abuse and misconduct.

And let me just note a few. The possible role of the White House in promoting misleading intelligence about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and ties to al Qaeda. Just recently, Mr. Speaker, a former CIA official, who served from 2000 to 2005 and has retired, penned a book that indicated that the intelligence was cherry-picked. Yet this House refused, refused to do any oversight; to ask a single question; to bring an executive branch official before the appropriate committee to ask questions that the American people deserve to have answers to.

And what about the responsibility of senior administration officials for abuses of detainees at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere? What about the role of the White House in withholding the Medicare cost estimates that were in their possession from Congress while we were debating a significantly expensive piece of legislation? In fact, it was acknowledged that the executive White House official in charge threatened to fire, he threatened to fire the Medicare actuary if he told Members of Congress that it was not going to cost \$395 billion, according to their estimate, but about \$700 billion. And again, no oversight.

And I could go on and on. But I have to tell you, if we are going to read the Constitution, if we are going to impose on ourselves the requirement, Mr. Speaker, to read the Constitution, then let us act in a constitutionally responsible way and meet our responsibility so that the American people know what is happening here in Washington and who is responsible.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is not just the war, Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course not.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is the war intelligence that no one here has asked any questions on. It is what is going on with the ports. It is the amount of borrowing that we are doing; this \$3 trillion in new debt this Republican Congress and the Republican Senate and House and White House has incurred on the American people and, just like in our own houses, we have to pay interest on that debt, that money that we borrow.

What we are having happen now, because of the reckless and fiscally irresponsible behavior of the Republican majority, it is impossible for us to make the kind of investments that we need to make here, Mr. Speaker. Every single family fundamentally understands the importance of education; yet here is what we have to fund because of all this borrowing. We pay this much on our interest on the debt, not even buying the debt down, but just paying the interest on it, Mr. MEEK. We have to pay almost \$230 billion in the 2007 budget.

These little blocks down here, these are the investments that we have to make in education, in homeland security, for veterans. Look how small they are compared to the interest on the debt.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. So what you are saying, Mr. RYAN, is that education could have \$250 billion; am I correct?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. Yes, if this money could be distributed to these other priorities.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Like homeland security and veterans?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Just wanted to be clear.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, these are our priorities as a country. And we can stand here and talk about port security, and we can talk about education all we want, and we can talk about what investments we need to make in alternative energy sources, and we can talk about the Democratic plan for innovation, research and development tax credits, broadband in every household, Mr. Speaker, in 5 years.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But the point is, Mr. RYAN, we cannot afford it because the debt that the American people now owe is in excess of \$8 trillion, and on that \$8 trillion we have to pay interest.

And what is the amount of interest on an annual basis, approximately? Do we have a range?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In 2007 it will be almost \$230 billion, with some interest.

Mr. DELAHUNT. So that is interest of \$230 billion. Just imagine what we could do with \$230 billion.

That interest, by the way, do you know where that interest is going to, at least a significant piece of it?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Japan.

Mr. DELAHUNT. China.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. OPEC countries.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And OPEC and other countries. Because to subsidize these substantial, very large tax cuts for just a small segment of the American people, we have to go into the financial markets and borrow money so that we can reduce taxes, and then that tax relief ends up not benefiting the vast majority of Americans.

But we are borrowing it. We are borrowing it from overseas. We are borrowing it from nations, many of whom could be potential adversaries, yet we are sending dollars over there of interest payments so that they can invest in roads, in health, and particularly in education, while we are slipping behind. We are slipping behind.

You know, there is a lot of talk in Washington about how this economy is growing. But what you never hear about is that the average American family is losing every year in terms of its income. It is going down. The most recent statistic was that in this past year it went down 2.7 percent. Well, that is hurting families. And that \$230 billion, let us say we just invested that. That is interest payments to China, to Japan, to other countries,

and to the OPEC countries. With \$230 billion, we could give every young person in this country a free college education, send them to the finest graduate schools in the country and ensure that their futures would be bright. But what we are doing is we are putting on our young people a debt that they will never, never in their lifetime be able to pay off. That is just simply wrong, and that is where we have a disagreement.

But you know what is interesting, and if I can just continue, because I am going to have to leave to catch a plane; but not only are Democrats criticizing this White House, but conservatives, people with impeccable conservative credentials like Bruce Bartlett, who just wrote a book and who served in the Reagan administration; like Andrew Sullivan, another noted conservative.

Well, here is what Andrew Sullivan said, and he wrote a book, too. I can't wait to read it. It is coming out soon. "The Conservative Soul: How We Lost It; How to Get It Back." Sullivan called Bush "reckless" and a "socialist" and accused him of betraying "almost every principle conservatism has ever stood for." Now, those are not my words, those are the words of Andrew Sullivan.

And Bruce Bartlett, a former Reagan administration official, had this to say. He called the administration unconscionable, irresponsible, vindictive and inept. And his book is entitled "How George W. Bush Bankrupted America and Betrayed the Reagan Legacy."

Yet here we are serving in this branch and we never, never meet or exercise our constitutional responsibility to review the actions of this administration, because the majority does not want to embarrass a Republican President. And I agree with much of what is said by these commentators: "This is a big government agenda. The notion that the Thatcher-Reagan legacy that many of us grew up to love and support would end this way is an astonishing paradox and a great tragedy."

Something is amiss when you have people with these conservative credentials making these harsh statements about this administration and this Republican Congress not daring to exercise its oversight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, that is powerful, very powerful stuff. I mean, that is good. And in addition to what the gentleman from Massachusetts said, the point is that it is not conservative to balance the budget. It just is what it is. You just do it. The Democrats did it in 1993 without one Republican vote. President Clinton got in with the Democratic House and a Democratic Senate and balanced the budget, Mr. MEEK. That is just what you do when you take your oath, when you swear to uphold the Constitution and preserve, protect, and defend the country.

Part of preserving, protecting, and defending the country is making sure we balance the budget, Mr. DELAHUNT.

□ 1830

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for spelling it out, and I do not want you to miss your plane. I want to thank you for coming down and sharing that information. We needed to hear it.

We have a number of Members running around here because they are following. They are following the Republican leadership on the Republican side and voting in a way that they probably could not go out on a street corner in their districts and if they were to ask 10 people, do you believe in this vote that I took, it would be probably two, maybe one and a half that may say that makes sense, give bigger subsidies to oil companies which are making record profits while we are paying more at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for putting the "something" into the 30-somethings.

Mr. RYAN, it comes down to leadership. That is the word, leadership, and making sure that the folks that woke up early one Tuesday morning to elect every Member of this House, if a Member leaves midterm, gets sick, whatever the case may be, I do not want to be in Congress any more, there has to be an election called and it has to be filled. The Governor cannot appoint someone like in the Senate.

I think it is important for us to be able to point out the irresponsibility that not only the President has carried out as it relates to being fiscally sound, not putting this country in a bad posture.

You have a chart there that talks about what we are facing right now. I am going to take maybe 5 minutes and go down the line, just in case a Member did not see us last night or the night before. I think it is important for everyone to understand what is going on.

Our good friend, Secretary Snow, the Secretary of the Treasury, wrote this letter about raising the debt ceiling on December 29, 2005. I was thinking about the new year, enjoying family. I was not in my office writing a letter saying we need to raise the debt ceiling. I do not blame Secretary Snow; I blame the policies of this Republican majority.

It says, "We will be unable to continue to finance government operations." Basically, he is saying we have to raise the debt ceiling, but that is the punch line. That is enough to send me running saying we need to do something immediately.

If the Democrats were in control, we would not have to go through this process because we believe in balancing budgets. The Republican majority says we want to cut it in half, or eventually by the year 2084 we would cut it in half. We are not saying that. We have balanced the budget, and we are about paying as we go so we do not get further into debt.

Secretary Snow wrote to Mr. SPRATT, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, just to say he has to now

go into what they call the G Fund, the Government Security Investment Fund, that is for the Federal Employee Retirement System. They are saying they can no longer pay into that because there is no money to do it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, this means that we already are not meeting our obligations. That already means that the financial constraints that the Republican majority has put upon us already is forcing the Secretary of the Treasury to not put money in to meet the obligations of the Federal employment retiree program.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RYAN is 110 percent right.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is the first step.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me say this, Mr. RYAN. He says, starting today, February 16. Now that is when you have waited as long as you can. When you write a letter talking about an action that you are going to take on that day, the same day, not that we cannot do it a week from now. Not that we can't do it on the 18th; I cannot do it the day I sign this letter.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He must have faxed it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It must have been faxed.

March 6, this letter is very, very alarming. As you can see through our discussion, we have stamped the rubber stamp Congress onto it. We have this rubber stamp, and it should be very familiar to the Members right now.

This is about the fact that they are going to do exactly what the administration asked them to do, and that is why we are in this situation and not able to meet our obligations.

We are going to go down memory lane real quickly. This is saying for the first time in U.S. history we will not be able to meet our Federal Government obligation, our financial obligations. That means paying our bills if the debt ceiling is not raised immediately. The Secretary is going into in this letter that he is going to have to use his special powers that he has been given to divert and no longer pay into and suspend paying into not only the G Fund but other governmental accounts, and it has to happen as soon as possible.

Mr. RYAN, how did we get into this situation, and who do we owe? How did we make history? And when I say "we," the Republican majority. Well, they made history by following the President, and by following the President, they made it in a wrong way, Mr. Speaker. No other time in the history of this country, no other time since the beginning of this country, and I am saying the history, and I am trying to crumble this thing down, since the beginning of the United States of America have we ever been in this situation and borrowing from foreign nations that is now reaching the 50 percent mark that we are going to owe foreign nations; \$1.05 trillion we have borrowed from foreign nations.

We have the Republican Congress right under the President's picture because the President could not do it on his own. Forty-two Presidents, \$1.01 trillion, 224 years; it took 224 years for 42 Presidents to borrow \$1.01 trillion from foreign nations.

Mr. RYAN, that means that the Great Depression, World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, all of the issues we have had as a country, they knew being financially sound as a country and paying our bills as we go, that borrowing, record-breaking borrowing from other countries was not a good thing to do, Democrats and Republicans. This President and this Republican Congress in 4 years.

So what is going to happen if we do not bring it under control now? You know we cannot do it alone. We have to have the majority to bring a stop to this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Borrow and spend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Borrow and spend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This President has not vetoed one spending bill, not one. So to say Congress needs to get its act in order, Congress is spending and the President is okaying it. Then the President puts his budget, and this Republican Congress gets out the rubber stamp, all at the expense of the next generation who are going to have to borrow and pay interest on this money to pay it back. Ultimately at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, it weakens the country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. To be able to paint this even further for the Members, I am going to put a couple of countries up, more than a couple up, thanks to the Republican majority, that own a piece of the American pie. This bothers me in putting these countries up, but I think it is important that we spell it out.

Mr. Speaker, when American civilization 500-600 years from now, when they start digging into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out what happened at this time, because I will guarantee you this, and I was talking to a group of veterans that came to my office today, this Congress, this Republican Congress, the 109th Congress and the President of the United States will go down in history, not in history of, oh, wow, something great happened, history in saying what were they doing? How did we get to the point that we owe so many foreign nations money? How did they buy a piece of the American pie? Why wasn't this an alarming time?

We want them to be able to unearth this map here.

U.K., they own \$223.2 billion of our debt. The U.K. did not make us do it; they just were available to say fine, because you are going to owe us.

Germany, that should mean something to some veterans, \$65.7 billion of our debt.

Taiwan, folks talk about Taiwan, many of the toys that are floating around the United States are made in Taiwan; and what they are doing with

the money, they are buying our debt, \$71.3 billion that they have of our debt.

Canada, the country just north of the United States of America, they own \$53.8 billion of our debt.

Korea, and that should mean something to our veterans, \$6.5 billion they have of our debt. We owe them.

OPEC nations, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, I can go down the line. OPEC nations, oil-producing nations, while we are here paying record-breaking prices for gas, they are flipping that around and getting a piece of the American pie financially at \$67.8 billion, OPEC nations.

China, Red China.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Communists.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Communist China, \$249.8 billion of U.S. debt they have purchased. We owe them.

Japan, the island of Japan I must add, the island of Japan, not as big as the United States, but we owe them a whopping \$682.8 billion. We owe them. The American people owe them. And we owe them because of the policies of the Republican majority and the White House.

Now, Mr. RYAN, let me say this. I do not care what party an American is affiliated with, if it is Republican, Democrat or Independent, or someone who does not vote at all. The bottom line is you are going to receive the tab for this. You are, not your children's children's children. You are. They are going to pay their fair share, but I guarantee if this Republican Congress continues to head down the track that it is heading down now, more countries will be on this map.

Like I said last night, when creditors call your house for you to pay them, they call you by your first name. They disrespect you from the beginning. They do not say, Mr. RYAN, maybe you can pay us whenever you feel like it. No, they say, TIM, you are going to pay this bill now. These are the terms; and if you do not do it, this is what we are going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I can see folks saying Mr. TIM RYAN and Mr. KENDRICK MEEK and Ms. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. DELAHUNT and the rest of the 30-something Working Group, they are just down there talking fiction. This is fact. We should be alarmed. We are alarmed, and more Members of this House should be outraged by the fact that we have allowed these countries. It is not because of their doing; it is because of the votes that went down on a party-line basis, not votes that went down along lines that are in the better interests of the people of the United States of America.

I challenge Members to go to your constituents and say, is this okay with you all? Is it okay that foreign nations own \$1.6 trillion of our debt? And this has all happened over a period of 4 years, and I want you to reelect me. I guarantee you there would not be a Member of this House that would put this on a T-shirt and say "reelect me." That is the reason why people need to understand how important this is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. At the same time, my friend, the Republican majority is borrowing and spending and borrowing and spending. They are not borrowing it from Sky Bank in downtown Warren, Ohio. They are not borrowing it from National Citibank.

□ 1845

They are borrowing it from these other countries. And at the same time, at the same exact time, Mr. Speaker, this Republican Congress has given \$6 billion in corporate welfare to the energy companies, primarily the oil companies, which are having their most profitable quarter, one after another, one after another; \$22 billion to the health care industry, Mr. Speaker. Corporate welfare.

So what the Republican majority is doing, my good friend, is they are borrowing money from the Japanese, the Chinese, and OPEC countries; and they are then taking that money that they are borrowing and then they are giving it in corporate welfare to the most profitable industries in the world. And at the same time, tuition costs go up, local property taxes go up, no investment into after-school programs, the significant kinds of investments that we need to allow our kids to be competitive in a global economy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I want to say something about that chart that is right behind you. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, how the American people end up going through what we call here in Washington the Potomac two-step. I will break it down a little further, how they get fooled, what one may say, bamboozled, hoodwinked. You go that way; I am going this way.

Let me just quarterback this thing for a minute, Mr. RYAN. As you can see, the increase in foreign borrowing is \$1.16 trillion on this chart. What the President has done and what this majority, the Republican House, has done, Mr. Speaker, is they have said, well, we will put it in this column and further down here in the corner where you have a \$0.02 trillion increase in domestic borrowing, we do not want folks to really know what we are doing. We want to borrow from these other nations and let us make a big deal here at home because if we make a big deal here at home, maybe, just maybe, Mr. RYAN, the American people will say, wait, slow down, easy on that credit card.

That is an interest rate. It is a \$230 billion interest rate per year, more than what we are investing in education, more than what we are investing in homeland security, since the President and the Republican majority are supposed to be the big homeland security people. More than what we are doing there.

Mr. RYAN, I know it is tough because I am living it, getting in this building at 8 o'clock in the morning, being in the middle of meetings, running from this end, going to committee meetings,

going to try to figure out what happened in the secret port deal, running over here and trying to get over to Armed Services so that we could hopefully get the truth of what is happening in Iraq or what is really going on. You have to run over to your other committees and try to figure out what is happening, meanwhile answering constituents' phone calls.

And, Mr. Speaker, meeting about what is happening in this dome, trying to find out what is going on, talking to staffers, I am going to tell you, I am just going to come clean, Mr. Speaker, we have got Republican staffers talking to the 30-something group about what is going on in the back scenes. That is how bad it is right here. That is how bad it is.

Congressman, excuse me, do not look at me, I just want to tell you something.

Congressman, here is a little note here. Maybe you need to talk about this because this is happening.

That is how we are able to unearth this stuff. That is how we are able to share with people what is going on. We have got Americans emailing us, saying, Hey, I am in the military and I am sick and tired of being sick and tired. Expose this.

The VA in my rural community is only open on the second Wednesday of each month, and they are talking about stopping that from happening.

Meanwhile, we have got folks around here advocating on behalf of billionaires, saying they want to make the tax cut permanent, or they want to give record-breaking subsidies to industries that are making record-breaking profits. And we have American families. Some are small businesses that are trying to provide health insurance for their employees, and we cannot help them?

The President marched down this aisle here. The Republican side stands up and claps, and we are all clapping when he comes in because he is the Commander in Chief and the President of the United States and the "leader" of the free world. And then we start talking about health care on only one side of the aisle. The Republican side can get up and start clapping. We are thinking the President is going to come with a comprehensive plan that we can all work together in a bipartisan way, a major paradigm shift in providing health care, Mr. RYAN.

No. What does he do? I just want to use an example. It is almost like going to the refrigerator, taking out a carton of milk, and saying, Oh, this is sour. Let me put it back in. Maybe it will be fresh tomorrow.

On the health care plan, they want to go back to health savings. There is already evidence that that is not working. We want to increase that plan. What do you have to do to be a part of the health savings plan? A, you have to have some savings. So you have to invest not only for your kid's college fund, where in the President's budget

and the Republican budget they are cutting student aid, and talk about innovation, that students will be able to compete against the kids in China and these other countries that are cleaning our clock right now as it relates to training and innovation and all these other areas, not because our students are not up to the fight. It is because we are not putting forth the kind of platform they need to be able to educate themselves financially.

So, Mr. RYAN, when we start talking about this issue of responsibility, it is not serving Americans enough for us to go the extra mile.

A supermajority of Members, Mr. Speaker, right now are already home. But let me tell you something. It is important that we continue to hammer at this nail.

Mr. RYAN, I want to commend you for doing what you do. And I know it is hard. I know it is hard to come here and do it, because we are doing it together along with other Members of this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say it time after time, that we must stop using the credit card and spending it on things that are not improving U.S. cities, that are not protecting America, that are not educating our children, and that are not bringing down gas prices that Americans are paying through the nose for right now.

So it is important because we are in this thing together. And I am going to tell you it is almost like the Congress being in first class and the American people being in coach. If the plane is going down, we are going down together. And I think it is important that we put a stop to using this credit card.

Mr. RYAN, I want you to put that chart up again about how much we are paying on the debt service. I want you to put that up because that goes right into what I am talking about. I want you to explain it one more time because the reason why I was able to make it through school was that my teachers kept going over the stuff, and we have got to make sure that some folks are coachable here because this is the information that is prepared and we get this from the U.S. Department of the Treasury, also from the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN, would you just explain that so people will understand what I am saying.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. All of this money that we are borrowing, we have got to pay interest on it. And if we pay the interest on it, that means that we cannot spend that money in other areas or give it back, in fact, to the taxpayer maybe in the form of a tax cut so there may be some middle class people.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. For a change.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. For a change, instead of giving it to Bill Gates and Warren Buffet, who themselves say they do not want the tax cut. Bill Clinton, who is making millions a year, we do not want the tax cut; make the proper investments.

From all the borrowing and spending and borrowing and spending that the Republicans have done, Mr. Speaker, this is the interest on the debt for 2007: \$230-some-odd billion. Of the tax money that the American people will send down here, 230 billion of it will go to those countries that Mr. MEEK mentioned to pay off the debt service. Meanwhile, education, homeland security, and veteran spending will be reduced here, here, and here.

Now, what the Democratic plan is to make sure that we ask the Warren Buffets of the world to pay their fair share, make the proper investments in the broadband research and development tax credit, and grow the economy so we can reduce this payment, and we can make sure that we properly fund and invest in education, homeland security, and veterans.

Now, if you want to just look at what we could do, my friend, if we did not have to pay that interest on the debt, the red bar, what would we be able to do with it? Sixty thousand kids we could enroll in Head Start to make sure that they have health care so they could be healthy, productive, educated citizens. Every single Member of Congress would get \$1 million a day for their congressional district, \$365 million for you, \$365 million for me, \$365 million for all 435 Members. Could you imagine what you could do in your district with \$365 million a year to spend if we did not have to pay that interest on the debt? Your schools; your transportation issues; your ports; the Coast Guard, which I know is there in the intercoastal; health care. Almost 80,000 veterans would be able to get health care, improve Social Security solvency by \$.5 billion. This is what we can do, my friend, when the Democrats take over. We will be able to move ourselves in this direction. Will it be a panacea? No. Because we have got a big mess to clean up when we take over this place.

But, Mr. Speaker, time and time and time again, the Republican majority went out, borrowed money, and spent it on corporate welfare for the most profitable industries, whether it was health care or whether it was the energy companies. Time and time and time again. And one of the provisions that the Democrats have tried and tried and tried to get on, we need a structure in which we could contain the reckless spending of the Republican majority, and what we have tried to do is put an amendment on bills that say if you spend money, you cannot borrow it. You either have to go and raise it, raise revenues somewhere, or you have to cut it out of another program so it is deficit neutral.

Mr. SPRATT, our leader on the Budget Committee, tried to put these PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, rules onto the 2006 budget resolution. It failed. Not one Republican voted for it. That is rollcall No. 87, March 17, 2005. I am not making this up. This is right in the rollcall. We wanted to put controls on spending. Republicans voted against it. Again in

the 2005 budget resolution, Mr. SPRATT tried to do it again, rollcall vote No. 91, March 25 of 2004. Not one Republican voted to contain the spending and put the pay-as-you-go rules on.

We also have been trying to do this for years now. For years. MIKE THOMPSON in California tried to do it. Charlie Stenholm of Texas tried to do it. DENNIS MOORE of Kansas tried to do it. What are the Democrats for? We are for balanced budgets, and the proof is in the pudding. The proof is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because we have tried to do it time and time and time again, and every time we have been shot down by the Republican majority.

So we are trying to contain spending so that we could reduce our debt payments so that we could take that money and provide broadband for every citizen in the country in the next 5 years, to have a strong, sufficient research and development tax credit, to encourage spending, investment, into innovative programs. We have a plan, and we know what we want to do.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I want you to get the Web site information up because I want to make sure Members have accurate information.

Also, I would just like to say that Members can go onto the Web site and get any of these charts that we have shared with them in the past and tonight so that they can see exactly what we are talking about if they need further information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. Drop us a line.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I want to thank you. I want to thank Mr. DELAHUNT for being a part of this 30-something hour.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have the time. It is an honor to address the House once again.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006, AT PAGE H737

Rollcall No. 23 printed incomplete in the RECORD of March 8, 2006. The corrected version follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Berkley	Boyd
Ackerman	Berman	Bradley (NH)
Aderholt	Berry	Brady (PA)
Akin	Biggert	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Brown (SC)
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Brown, Corrine
Baca	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Bachus	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Baird	Blunt	Buyer
Baker	Boehert	Calvert
Baldwin	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Campbell (CA)
Barrow	Bonner	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Capito
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Capuano
Bass	Boren	Cardin
Bean	Boswell	Cardoza
Beauprez	Boucher	Carnahan
Becerra	Boustany	Carson

Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culbertson
Cummins
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Herseth
Higgins

Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Ingalls (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Blackburn
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Cannon
Doolittle

Burton (IN)
Capps
Costa
Cubin

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz

NAYS—12

Foxx
Goode
Istook
Jones (NC)
McHenry

NOT VOTING—11

Davis (KY)
Evans
Gonzalez
Hinojosa

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Paul
Shuster
Westmoreland

Mr. OTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on March 8, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3199. To extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 13, 2006, at 2 p.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of July 21, 2005, through January 3, 2006, shall be treated as through received on March 9, 2006. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant Congressional Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6584. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report of surplus real property transferred for public health purposes, including purposes authorized by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2005 annual report as required by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9620; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6586. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Surface Coating of Metal Cans [OAR-2003-0005; FRL-8018-9] (RIN: 2060-AM28) received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6587. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Emission Durability Procedures for New Light-Duty Vehicles, Light-Duty Trucks and Heavy-Duty Trucks [FRL-8019-2] (RIN: 2060-AK76) received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6588. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. NORWOOD (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 14, 15, and 16.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Vigo County Non-attainment Area to Attainment of the 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-IN-0010; FRL-8019-5] received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6589. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Emission Reductions to Meet Phase II of the Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) SIP Call [EPA-R03-OAR-2005-WV-0002; FRL-8020-4] received January 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6590. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [MD200-3116; FRL-8021-7] received January 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6591. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-CA-0016; FRL-8007-6] received December 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6592. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-CA-0015; FRL-8010-7] received December 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6593. A letter from the Registrar of Copyrights, Copyright Office, transmitting a schedule of proposed Copyright Office fees and the accompanying analysis, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 708(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6594. A letter from the Ombudsman for Part E, Department of Labor, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Ombudsman for Part E of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7385s-15(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6595. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the reports of the Chief Engineers on the projects listed, consistent with Section 109 of Pub. L. 109-103; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6596. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the draft and final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Ecosystem Restoration Plan for Green/Duamish River Basin in King County, Washington; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6597. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project Report for the Dare County Beaches, North Carolina; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6598. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [CGD09-05-131] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6599. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Validation of Merchant Mariners' Vital Information and Issuance of Coast Guard Merchant Mariner's Licenses and Certificates of Registry [USCG-2004-17455] (RIN: 1625-AA85) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6600. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Shipping Technical, Organizational and Conforming Amendments [USCG-2005-22329] (RIN: 1625-ZA05) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6601. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; San Pedro Bay, CA [CGD11-04-007] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6602. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Models DG-800B and DG-500MB Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22206; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-45-AD; Amendment 39-14432; AD 2005-26-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6603. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BURKHARDT GROB LUFT-UND RAUMFAHRT GmbH & CO KG Model G103 TWIN ASTIR Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22156; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-43-AD; Amendment 39-14435; AD 2005-26-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6604. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BURKHARDT GROB LUFT-UND RAUMFAHRT GmbH & CO KG Models G103 TWIN ASTIR, G103 TWIN II, G103A TWIN II ACRO, G103C TWIN III ACRO, and G 103 C Twin III SL Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20803; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-19-AD; Amendment 39-14433; AD 2005-26-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6605. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Cessna Aircraft Company Models 208 and 208B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21275; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-28-AD; Amendment 39-14450; AD 2006-01-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6606. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Frakes Aviation

(Gulfstream American) Model G-73 (Mallard) series airplanes and Model G-73 airplanes that have been converted to have turbine engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-23440; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-256-AD; Amendment 39-14452; AD 2006-01-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6607. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Corporation Ltd. Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23473; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-54-AD; Amendment 39-14451; AD 2005-26-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6608. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corporation Models 7AC, 7ACA, S7AC, 7BCM, 7CCM, S7CCM, 7DC, S7DC, 7EC, S7EC, 7ECA, 7FC, 7GC, 7GCA, 7GCAA, 7GCB, 7GCBA, 7GCBC, 7HC, 7JC, 7KC, 7KCAB, 8KCAB, and 8GCBC Airlines [Docket No. FAA-2005-23025; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-50-AD; Amendment 39-14390; AD 2005-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6609. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21975; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-14365; AD 2005-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6610. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21835; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-35-AD; Amendment 39-14357; AD 2005-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6611. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Power Systems (formerly Sundstrand Power Systems) Auxiliary Power Units Models T-62T-46C2, T-62T-46C2A, T-62T-46C3, T-62T-46C7, and T-62T-46C7A [Docket No. FAA-2005-21719; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-14369; AD 2005-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6612. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CF6-80E1A1, -80E1A2, -80E1A3, -80E1A4, and -80E1A4/B Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22712; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-14367; AD 2005-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6613. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Oxygen [Docket No. FAA-2005-22915; Amendment No. 121-322] (RIN: 2120-a165) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6614. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Astazou XIV B and XIV H Turboshift Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-23004; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-42-AD; Amendment 39-14405; AD 2005-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6615. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-38-AD; Amendment 39-14404; AD 2005-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6616. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Type R321/4-82-F/8, R324/4-82-F/9, R333/4-82-F/12, and R334/4-82-F/13 Propeller Assemblies [Docket No. 2001-NE-50-AD; Amendment 39-14403; AD 2005-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6617. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CENTRAIR 101 Series Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2005-21951; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-39-AD; Amendment 39-14381; AD 2005-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6618. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes, and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22256; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-14378; AD 2005-23-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6619. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on the regulatory status of the National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) "Most Wanted" Recommendations to the Department and its Operating Administrations for calendar year ended 2005, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1135(d) Public Law 108-168, section 6; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6620. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Register Dispositions of Petitions for Exemption [Docket No. FAA-2005-22982; Amendment No. 11-51] (RIN: 2120-AI69) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6621. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Noise Stringency Increase for Single-Engine Propeller-Driven Small Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-17041; Amendment No. 36-28] (RIN: 2120-AH44) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6622. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maintenance Recording Requirements [Docket No. FAA-2005-23495; Amendment No. 21-87,

121-321, 135-104] (RIN: 2120-AI67) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6623. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anti-drug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Programs for Personnel Engaged in Specified Aviation Activities [Docket No. FAA-2002-11301; Amendment No. 121-315] (RIN: 2120-AH14) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6624. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service Difficulty Reports [Docket No. FAA-2000-7952; Amendment Nos. 121-319, 125-49, 135-102, and 145-26] (RIN: 2120-AI08) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6625. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Guidelines for Awarding Clean Water Act Section 319 Base Grants to Indian Tribes in FY 2006; Request for Proposals from Indian Tribes for Competitive Grants under Clean Water Act Section 319 in FY 2006 (CFDA66.460-Nonpoint Source Implementation Grants; Funding Opportunity Number EPA-OW-OWOW-06-2) [FRL-8021-6] received January 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6626. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act [OW-FRL-8020-3] received January 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6627. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Allotment Formula for Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 106 Funds; Amendment [EPA-HQ-OW-2005-0038; FRL-8017-9] received December 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6628. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Propane Consumer Impact Analysis regarding the operations of the Propane Education and Research Council, pursuant to Public Law 104-284, section 12; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 4911. A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for hospitals; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of corrosion prevention and mitigation measures in the construction and maintenance of business property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 4914. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove certain limitations on attorney representation of claimants for veterans benefits in administrative proceedings before the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 4915. A bill to amend section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to implement certain recommendations relating to the review of certain mergers, acquisitions, or takeovers by or with any foreign person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 4916. A bill to authorize United States participation in, and appropriations for, the United States contribution to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 4917. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to require notification to Congress after receipt of written notification of proposed or pending mergers, acquisitions, or takeovers subject to investigation under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4918. A bill to permit the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for air and water pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 4919. A bill to extend the educational flexibility program under section 4 of the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to reform the ethics process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4921. A bill to amend the Act popularly known as the Death on the High Seas

Act to limit application of that Act to maritime accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4922. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to add National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day to the list of days on which the flag should especially be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4923. A bill to abolish the death penalty under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SABO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 4924. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 4925. A bill to improve whistleblower protections; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for counting expenses for nonformulary drugs against the Medicare annual out-of-pocket threshold for costs for covered part D drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to enhance the effectiveness of the investigations of certain mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers for national security implications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, International Relations, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify that State and local permitting requirements relating to the processing, sorting, or transporting of solid waste apply to rail carriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 4931. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to revise the regulations regarding the Do-not-call registry to prohibit politically-oriented recorded message telephone calls to telephone numbers listed on that registry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 4932. A bill to require businesses operating a call center to either initiate or receive telephone calls to disclose the location of such call center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4933. A bill to prevent acid mine drainage from sulfide mining into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4934. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to modify the definition of "Indian student count"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4935. A bill to designate as wilderness certain lands within the Rocky Mountain National Park and to adjust the boundaries of the Indian Peaks Wilderness and the Arapaho National Recreation Area on the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to modify provisions relating to the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for continuity of coverage of prescription drugs under Medicare prescription drug plans for full-benefit dual eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the 2006 open enrollment period for Medicare prescription

drug plans and to eliminate any late enrollment penalty for enrollments in such plans at any time during 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H. Con. Res. 355. Concurrent resolution recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 715. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H. Res. 716. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the establishment of a National Blood Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H. Res. 717. A resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 718. A resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the Dubai Ports World acquisition of 6 United States commercial ports leases; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHHEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 719. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Wendy Wasserstein; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FORD, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 720. A resolution honoring the life of Gordon Roger Alexander Buchanan Parks; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr.

SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 721. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a Salvadoran-American Day (El Día del Salvadoreño) in recognition of all Salvadoran-Americans for their hard work, dedication, and contribution to the stability and well-being of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

269. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 95 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reauthorizing the Ryan White CARE Act to provide comprehensive care for the neediest victims of HIV/AIDS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

270. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 411 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the development of a secure electronic balloting system for active duty military personnel; to the Committee on House Administration.

271. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 565 supporting the CORRIDORone regional rail proposal and encouraging its support by counties and municipalities in the region of the CORRIDORone project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

272. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to immediately close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and return the area to essential coastal wetlands and marshes and memorializing the Louisiana congressional delegation to file the necessary legislation to accomplish this closure; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

273. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 32 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

274. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 461 memorializing the Congress of the United States to revise the requirement that applicants for hunting and fishing licenses provide their Social Security numbers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 97: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 159: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 161: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 164: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 170: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 202: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 282: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H.R. 303: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 311: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 398: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 475: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 478: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 533: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 550: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 552: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 561: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 583: Mr. WICKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 801: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 817: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 838: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 864: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 874: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 880: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 898: Mr. LEACH, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 986: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1241: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 1302: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1306: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1329: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1333: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1356: Mr. SIMMONS and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1401: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1504: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1548: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1578: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1633: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1639: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1652: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1814: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1951: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2047: Mr. RENZI.
H.R. 2070: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2121: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 2134: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 2177: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 2257: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2330: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FELNER, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2386: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2410: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2416: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2421: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2429: Ms. HERSETH and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2471: Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 2561: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2719: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2780: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2861: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2928: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2952: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 2962: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3019: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 3037: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3098: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3127: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3145: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 3159: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3248: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 3267: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3352: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3361: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 3380: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3476: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3550: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DENT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3559: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3576: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3579: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3598: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3628: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3640: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3641: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3658: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3717: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3838: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 3858: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3907: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 3936: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4005: Mr. NEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4019: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 4022: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4033: Mr. HONDA, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4042: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 4045: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4121: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 4140: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4156: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4211: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4217: Mr. ISSA and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4222: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 4227: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 4229: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4282: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 4298: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4318: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 4332: Mr. POE.
H.R. 4341: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4366: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 4372: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4400: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 4421: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4493: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4547: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4609: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4666: Ms. HART and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 4681: Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMBO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4704: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 4709: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4720: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 4727: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 4740: Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 4747: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 4755: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 4760: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 4761: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. POE, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 4772: Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 4775: Mr. POE and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4776: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4780: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4781: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 4790: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 4793: Mr. OLVER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4794: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4798: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 4799: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 4806: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4813: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 4824: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 4828: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4830: Mrs. BONO and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 4834: Mr. McCOTTER.
 H.R. 4859: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 4867: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. CASTLE.
 H.R. 4873: Mr. PICKERING and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 4881: Mr. GORDON and Mr. BARROW.
 H.R. 4890: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 4899: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 4902: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina,

Mr. PITTS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. REYES, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. CANTOR.
 H.J. Res. 53: Mr. CHOCOLA.
 H.J. Res. 55: Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.J. Res. 78: Mr. EVANS.
 H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. LEACH.
 H. Con. Res. 197: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H. Con. Res. 282: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H. Con. Res. 287: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. McINTYRE, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 328: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BONO, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 339: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 353: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Con. Res. 354: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. KING of New York.
 H. Res. 305: Mr. HOLT and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 327: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 498: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 526: Mr. SAXTON.
 H. Res. 603: Mr. BACA.
 H. Res. 635: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. SANDERS.
 H. Res. 636: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H. Res. 637: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H. Res. 675: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H. Res. 691: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 700: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. GERLACH.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. McNULTY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. EDWARDS on House Resolution 271: Wm. Lacy Clay.

Petition 6 by Mr. ABERCROMBIE on House Resolution 543: Wm. Lacy Clay, Tom

Lantos, Linda T. Sánchez, Bob Filner, and Xavier Becerra.

Petition 7 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 568: Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Wm. Lacy Clay, Tom Lantos, Bart Gordon, Frank Pallone, Jr., Leonard L. Boswell, Louis McIntosh Slaughter, and Linda T. Sánchez.

Petition 8 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 570: Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Wm. Lacy Clay, Tom Lantos, Frank Pallone, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, Leonard L. Boswell, and Louis McIntosh Slaughter.

Petition 9 by Mr. BOSWELL on House Resolution 584: Bernard Sanders, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Wm. Lacy Clay, Tom Lantos, Grace F. Napolitano, and Dennis J. Kucinich.

Petition 10, by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 585: Bernard Sanders, Benjamin L. Cardin, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Wm. Lacy Clay, Tom Lantos, Steve Israel, David Scott, Jim Marshall, Gregory W. Meeks, Edolphus Towns, Chris Van Hollen, Leonard L. Boswell, Grace F. Napolitano, and Dennis J. Kucinich.

Petition 11, by Mr. BARROW on House Resolution 614: Collin C. Peterson, Sherrod Brown, Elijah E. Cummings, Bernard Sanders, Peter A. DeFazio, Steny H. Hoyer, Wm. Lacy Clay, Rush D. Holt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Ted Strickland, Lloyd Doggett, Tom Lantos, Adam B. Schiff, Steve Israel, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Marion Berry, Vic Snyder, Arthur Davis, Raul M. Grijalva, Michael H. Michaud, Michael M. Honda, Solomon P. Ortiz, Gene Green, Jim Cooper, Bart Gordon, Carolyn B. Maloney, James P. McGovern, Frank Pallone, Jr., Rick Larsen, Chris Van Hollen, Julia Carson, Leonard L. Boswell, Nydia M. Velázquez, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Darlene Hooley, Brad Sherman, Russ Carnahan, Stephen F. Lynch, David Scott, Grace F. Napolitano, Edward J. Markey, Bob Etheridge, Charles B. Randel, Henry A. Waxman, Bobby L. Rush, Corrine Brown, Anna G. Eshoo, Mike Ross, Donald M. Payne, Susan A. Davis, Linda T. Sánchez, Danny K. Davis, Hilda L. Solis, Charlie Melancon, Alcee L. Hastings, Bob Filner, Eliot L. Engel, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Howard L. Berman, Brian Higgins, Diana DeGette, Robert A. Brady, Ed Pastor, Paul E. Kanjorski, Doris O. Matsui, Ben Chandler, Xavier Becerra, Emanuel Cleaver, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas H. Allen, Jay Inslee, Brad Miller, José E. Serrano, Mike McIntyre, Melvin L. Watt, Kendrick B. Meek, Rubén Hinojosa, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Albert Russell Wynn, Chaka Fattah, Gary L. Ackerman, William D. Delahunt, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Lee, John F. Tierney, Sander M. Levin, Tim Ryan, David R. Obey, Ron Kind, Rahm Emanuel, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Dennis A. Cardoza, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Michael E. Capuano, Lois Capps, Anthony D. Weiner, Sam Farr, Dale E. Kildee, Jerry F. Costello, Stephanie Herseth, Nita M. Lowey, Major R. Owens, Neil Abercrombie, Dennis J. Kucinich, and Robert C. Scott.